DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 657 UD 023 425

TITLE	Oversight Hearing on Restoring Funding to the Child Nutrition Programs. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	28 Sep 83
NOTE	83p.; Small print.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Breakfast Programs; Children; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; *Financial Support; Food; Hearings; Lunch Programs; *Nutrition; Poverty; Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS	Child Care Food Program; *Entitlement Programs; Food Stamp Program

ABSTRACT

Three witnesses gave testimony at this hearing on restoring $150 million in entitlement funding to Federal child nutrition programs. They were Ernest Morial, Mayor of New Orleans, representing the U.S. Conference of Mayors' Task Force on Joblessness and Hunger; Faith Gravenmier, representing the American School Food Service Association; and Lynn Parker, representing the Food Research and Action Center. All three, besides offering suggestions for using the restored funds in their oral testimony, presented prepared statements for inclusion in the record. Morial also presented, in his oral testimony, omnibus anti-hunger legislation prepared by the Conference of Mayors and, for inclusion in the record, a survey of human services in 1982 and eight case studies of hunger in American cities prepared by the Conference of Mayors. The cities covered in the survey include Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, New Orleans, Oakland (CA), Rochester, and San Antonio. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON RESTORING FUNDING TO THE CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

ED241657

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD PS
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,
SEPTEMBER 28, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UD023425

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
27-391 O WASHINGTON : 1984

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
RICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
(Vacancy)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
RICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
RON PACKARD, California
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on September 28, 1983	1
Statement of:	
Gravenmier, Faith, director of child nutrition, State of West Virginia, representing the American School Food Service Association, accompanied by Jim Miller, chairman of the American School Food Service Association Industry Advisory Council	60
Morial, Ernest, mayor of the city of New Orleans, representing: U.S. Conference of Mayors, task force on joblessness and hunger; accompanied by Laura Dekoven Waxman, assistant executive director, U.S. Conference of Mayors	1
Parker, Lynn, staff nutritionist, Food Research and Action Center [FRAC]	62
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:	
Gravenmier, Faith, the American School Food Service Association, prepared statement of	59
Morial, Hon. Ernest N., mayor of New Orleans, chair, advisory board, chair, task force on joblessness and hunger, U.S. Conference of Mayors:	
"Human Services in FY 1982: Shrinking Resources in Troubled Times," article entitled	8
"Hunger in American Cities," eight case studies, June 1983	24
Prepared statement of	2
Parker, Lynn, Food Research and Action Center, prepared statement of	62

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON RESTORING FUNDING TO THE CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:35 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Hawkins, Goodling, Packard, and Gunderson.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, majority counsel; Joleen Frederick, legislative specialist; and Mary Jane Fiske, Republican senior legislative associate.

Chairman PERKINS. Let's close the doors and get quiet. The committee will come to order.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is holding a hearing today on Federal child nutrition programs.

As you know, the congressional budget resolution allows us to restore $150 million in entitlement funding to these programs. Next Tuesday, October 4, the subcommittee will have a markup in order to write a bill restoring these funds.

We are here today to hear testimony as to how these funds should be restored. Our first witness today is the mayor of New Orleans, Mayor Morial, representing the U.S. Conference of Mayors Task Force on Joblessness and Hunger. We have another witness, Faith Gravenmier, director of child nutrition, State of West Virginia. She is representing the American School Food Service Association. Also we have Lynn Parker, staff nutritionist, Food Research and Action Center.

We will hear from you first this morning, Mayor Morial. Identify yourself for the record and proceed in any way you prefer.

STATEMENT OF ERNEST MORIAL, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, REPRESENTING U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, TASK FORCE ON JOBLESSNESS AND HUNGER, ACCOMPANIED BY LAURA DEKOVEN WAXMAN, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

[The prepared statement of Mayor Ernest N. Morial follows:]

(1)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST N. MORIAL, MAYOR OF NEW ORLEANS, CHAIR, ADVISORY BOARD, TASK FORCE ON JOBLESSNESS AND HUNGER, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Ernest N. Morial, Mayor of New Orleans and Chairman of the Conference of Mayors Task Force on Joblessness and Hunger. I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you this morning to discuss what we see happening in cities today and to present our recommendations for solving some of this nation's most pressing urban problems.

Many of the residents of our cities have faced substantial difficulties in the last several years. Our poor economy and high unemployment have taken away many jobs. We have seen the emergence of the "new poor," people who have lost their jobs, exhausted their savings, exhausted their benefits, and now must grapple with our complex human service system, often for the first time. Cuts in federal programs have reduced or removed the support that many people need for basic survival. Welfare, food stamps, medicaid, energy assistance, social services all have been cut.

We once again see the images of the Great Depression: Thousands of people waiting in line for food; homeless people in our cities—with no place to go; and families packed into their cars, travelling from city to city in search of jobs.

Since there problems became evident a year ago, the Conference of Mayors has been working hard to document the problems faced by people in cities and to develop solutions to them. Last fall we conducted a survey on the combined impact of federal budget cuts, economic conditions, and high unemployment on urban residents. We found that in none of the human service areas examined was even 50 percent of the eligible population being served for the 55 cities surveyed. City officials estimated that only 43 percent of the emergency service needs were being met.

This spring we developed case studies on hunger in eight cities across the nation. Despite differing local economic conditions and rates of unemployment, all of the cities examined experienced a recent dramatic increase in the demand for emergency food assistance and only three of the eight cities were able to serve all of those in need of food assistance, two of them just barely. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to submit a copy of these reports for the record.

Over the last year we have worked at the federal level—proposing legislative and administrative responses. And we have provided information to mayors and others in cities to help them to respond to local needs—for food, shelter, energy.

Last month in the offices of the Conference of Mayors I convened a meeting of mayors, other key city officials, representatives of private corporations involved in food processing, packaging and distribution, and representatives of non-profit organizations—both national groups and those involved directly in service delivery in cities. The purpose of the meeting was to identify the actions that can be taken by all of us working together to respond to the increasing demand for emergency food assistance in cities.

We discussed a number of efforts that are currently underway in cities or could be developed to respond to the problems. But we realized that the magnitude of the problem was so great that there was no way that people in cities—the public and private sectors working together—could respond to the problems using the resources available to them. Only the federal government has the resources to do that.

This morning I present to you omnibus anti-hunger legislation. It represents the culmination of many of our efforts of the last year. The proposals included in it could help significantly to meet the needs identified at our meeting last month and by mayors and many many others across the Nation for the last year. While the legislation I am proposing goes beyond the jurisdiction of this Committee, a portion of it relates specifically to the subject of this hearing—the school lunch and other child nutrition programs.

The funding for almost all of our omnibus anti-hunger proposals is already included in the fiscal year 1984 budget resolution passed by the Congress this summer. It includes restorations in the Food Stamp, WIC, and child nutrition programs and a continuation of the emergency assistance program included in the Jobs Bill passed last winter, but due to expire this week. We estimate that all of these provisions would amount to approximately $1 billion in additional federal support.

In the programs which require changes in the authorizing language, we are basically interested that the restorations be made. We remain flexible as to how they might be made. We have several principles to suggest to you, however, as you consider restorations in the child nutrition programs: The needs of the working poor should be addressed by lowering the cost and raising eligibility for the reduced-price

breakfast and lunch programs; the nutritional quality of the breakfast program should be improved; and the child care feeding program should be strengthened.

The intention of all of these principles is to strengthen and improve the nutritional integrity of the child nutrition programs. That is our goal, and I know that it is your goal as well.

I would like to take a moment to outline some of the other principles of our omnibus anti-hunger proposals.

For the food stamp program we suggest that: The full amount of the thrifty food plan be paid; the assets test, for both vehicle and liquid assets be adjusted so that the working poor can participate more fully in the program; the program be made more sensitive to high shelter costs; and nutrition education and information be provided

For the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program we suggest sufficient funding for fiscal year 1984 to maintain the current caseload.

Finally, we feel that there is an urgent need to continue to provide support for the emergency food and shelter efforts underway in cities across the country. The funds for this purpose included in the Jobs Bill made the difference in many communities. We have heard concerns expressed about the difficulties sure to arise this winter if funds are not provided once again for emergency assistance. We suggest that funds be provided directly by the federal government to city governments and that they be targetted to those areas of greatest need, as defined by high unemployment and/or poverty rates and other factors such as high numbers of homeless people.

Our omnibus anti-hunger legislation includes badly needed restorations in the fundamental federal food assistance programs—food stamps, WIC and child nutrition—which while adequately funded went a long way toward eliminating hunger in this nation. In addition it includes emergency assistance to respond to the special problems we face today. Emergency feeding programs—soup kitchens, food cupboards—are responses that must be made, responses that a caring society demands. But they treat the problem; they do not prevent it.

The link between joblessness and hunger is clear. We will never bring an end to hunger until there is work for all who need it. Knowing this the Conference of Mayors has just established this Task Force on Joblessness and Hunger which I chair. Through this Task Force we will continue to document the severity of the problems in the coming months. And we will be pleased to report our findings to you Mr. Chairman. We will also continue to press for federal action—in jobs as well as nutrition programs—that will ease the problems that we face.

We appreciate the work of this Committee in the jobs area and congratulate you on the passage in the House of the Community Renewal and Employment Act. Be assured that we will do all that we can to achieve positive action on that bill in the Senate.

We look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, on the child nutrition program, as well as the other components of the anti-hunger bill. What we see happening in this country today is a national tragedy and a national disgrace. We cannot afford to let it continue.

Mayor MORIAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Ernest N. Morial, mayor of the city of New Orleans and chairman of the Conference of Mayors Task Force on Joblessness and Hunger.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, I would like to express my deep thanks and appreciation to you for affording us an opportunity to appear before you and the members of your committee today to talk briefly about some of the things that are happening in our cities and to present to you some of our recommendations for solving some of the Nation's most pressing urban problems.

As I am sure you and the members of your committee and staff are aware, many of the residents of our cities have faced substantial difficulties in the last several years. The nature of our economy at the present time, with high unemployment has reduced jobs in our country, and, as a result of that, we have had the emergence of a new poor—people who have lost their jobs, exhausted their savings, exhausted their benefits and now must grapple with our com-

plex human service system—something that for many of them is foreign and for many it's a first-time experience.

Cuts in Federal programs have reduced or removed the support that many people need for basic survival in this Nation—welfare, food stamps, medicaid, energy assistance, social services. All have been severely cut. We once again in this Nation see some of the images of the Great Depression. As a boy who grew up during that period of time, I can reflect back upon those conditions—thousands of people waiting in line for food, homeless people in our cities with no place to go, families packed in cars—those that had cars—those that didn't, parked on the streets—traveling from city to city in search of jobs.

When these problems became evident a year ago, the Conference of Mayors began working hard to document those problems faced in cities and also to develop solutions and proposals and recommendations for dealing with them.

Last fall we conducted a survey on the combined impact of Federal budget cuts, economic conditions, and high unemployment on our urban residents. We found that none of the human service areas examined was even 50 percent of the eligible population being served for the 55 cities we surveyed. City officials estimated that only 43 percent of the emergency services needs were being met.

This past spring we developed case studies on hunger in eight cities across the Nation. Despite differing local economic conditions and rates of unemployment, all of these cities experienced a recent dramatic increase in the demand for emergency food assistance, and only three of the eight cities were able to serve all of those in need of food assistance, two of them just barely.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a copy of the reports which were prepared as a result of our studies and our research. Over the past year we have worked at the Federal level proposing legislation and administrative responses. We have also provided information to mayors and other cities to help them respond to local needs for food, shelter, and energy.

Last month, we conducted a meeting of mayors and other key city officials, representatives of private cooperations involved in food processing, packaging and distribution and representatives of nonprofit organizations—both national groups and those involved directly in service delivery in cities. The purpose of the meeting was to identify the actions that can be taken by all of us working together to respond to the increasing demand for emergency food assistance in our cities.

We discussed a number of efforts that are currently underway in cities or could be developed to respond to the problems. One thing that came home very clear and very vividly was that the magnitude of the problem was so great that there was no way that people in the cities—the public and private sectors working together—could respond to the problems using the resources that were available to them. Only the Federal Government has the resources to do that.

This morning I would like to present to you an omnibus antihunger legislation. This effort results in the culmination of many of our efforts of last year. The proposals in it could help significant-

ly to meet the needs identified at our meeting last month and by mayors and many others across the Nation for the last year. While the legislation we are proposing goes beyond the jurisidiction of this committee, a portion of it does relate specifically to the subject of this hearing—the school lunch and other child nutrition programs.

The funding for almost all of our omnibus anti-hunger proposals is already included in the fiscal year 1984 budget resolution passed by the Congress this summer. It includes restorations——

Chairman PERKINS. Let me interrupt you there just a moment.

When Gramm-Latta II was enacted, we cut the reimbursement rate to about 21.5 cents from 33.5 cents for each meal served. In the school lunch program that's about what it averaged. In your poorer schools in New Orleans, did you notice any dropout in your free and reduced price—did we affect the reduced-price lunches down there in the inner city areas in your State?

Mayor MORIAL. Yes, sir, as a result of the lowered Federal reimbursement rate, we saw a loss of approximately 3,000 students and based upon our evaluation and examination of that, we have concluded that that was directly related to the lowered Federal reimbursement rate.

Chairman PERKINS. To what extent has the legislation affected food stamps to needy recipients, old-aged people receiving retirement or people within the poverty level? What is that cutback figure?

Mayor MORIAL. The numbers have increased substantially as a result of those reductions.

Chairman PERKINS. Go right ahead. You are making a good statement.

Mayor MORIAL. As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, much of the funding for what we propose is already included in the budget resolution. It includes restorations, as I indicated, in the food stamp program, WIC, child nutrition programs, and a continuation of the emergency assistance programs included in the jobs bill which was passed last winter, but due to expire this week. We estimate that all of the provisions that we suggest would amount to approximately $1 billion in additional Federal support.

In the programs which require changes in the authorizing language, we are basically interested that the restorations be made. We have no specifics, but we remain flexible as to how that might be done. We have several principles which we would like to suggest to you, sir, as you consider restorations in the child nutrition programs: One, the needs of the working poor should be addressed by lowering the cost and raising eligibility for the reduced price breakfast and lunch programs; two, the nutritional quality of the breakfast program should be improved; three, the child care feeding program should be strengthened.

The intention of all of these is to strengthen and improve the nutritional integrity of the child nutrition programs. That is our goal and I know that that is your goal as well, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take a moment to outline some of the other principles, with your permission, of our omnibus antihunger proposals.

For food stamp program, we suggest that: The full amount of the thrifty food plan be paid; two, the assets test, for both vehicle and

liquid assets be adjusted so that the working poor can participate more fully in the program; three, the program be made more sensitive to high shelter and costs; four, nutrition information and education be provided. We think the latter is essential so that persons will know how to access a very complex system.

For the women, infants, and children program we suggest sufficient funding for fiscal year 1984 to maintain the current caseload.

Finally, we feel that there is a urgent need to continue to provide support for emergency food and shelter efforts underway in the cities across the Nation. The funds for this purpose included in the Jobs Bill made the difference in many communities. We have heard concerns expressed about the difficulties which will arise this winter if funds are not provided once again for emergency assistance.

We suggest that funds be provided directly by the Federal Government to city governments and that they be targeted to those areas of greatest need, as defined by high unemployment or poverty rates and other factors, such as the high number of homeless people.

Our omnibus antihunger legislation also includes badly needed restorations in fundamental Federal food assistance programs—food stamps, WIC, child nutrition—which while adequately funded went a long way toward eliminating hunger in this Nation.

In addition, our proposal includes emergency assistance to respond to the special problems we face today. Emergency feeding programs—soup kitchens, food cupboards—are responses that must be made, responses, we feel, that a caring society demands and responses that will meet our moral obligation in this Nation. But they treat the problem; they do not prevent it.

As we have discovered—and I am sure that you are very much aware of this, Mr. Chairman, because of the work that you and your committee have done—that there is a link between joblessness and hunger, and that link is dramatically clear. We will never bring an end to hunger until there is work for all who need or want it in this country.

Knowing this, the Conference of Mayors has established this Task Force on Joblessness and Hunger. Through this task force we intend to continue to document the severity of the problems in the coming months and we will be pleased, Mr. Chairman, to report our findings to you. We will also continue to press for Federal action in jobs as well as in nutrition programs that will ease the problems that we face.

We appreciate deeply the work of your committee in the jobs area and congratulate you and Congressman Hawkins on the passage of the Community Renewal and Employment Act. We are, indeed, grateful to each of you and particularly to Congressman Hawkins, a native Louisianian for having sponsored that bill.

We look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on the child-nutrition program, as well as the other components of our antihunger bill. What we see happening in this country today is a national tragedy and a national disgrace and I am pleased to have heard that the members of the President's task force, apparently based upon their statements yesterday, agree with that conclusion.

But it is up to all of us, as has been indicated earlier this morning, to work in tandem and as a partnership to see that this national tragedy and this national disgrace is aborted immediately.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much for an excellent statement. Without objection, the survey and case studies that you requested to be included in the record will be included at this point.

[The survey, "Human Services in Fiscal Year 1982: Shrinking Resources in Troubled Times," and the eight case studies on "Hunger in American Cities" follow:]

HUMAN SERVICES IN FY82:

SHRINKING RESOURCES IN TROUBLED TIMES

A Survey of Human Services Officials in the Nation's Cities

October, 1982

The United States Conference of City Human Services Officials

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

SUMMARY

To assess the status of human services in cities at the start of the new fiscal year, the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials surveyed its members to determine: 1) the program areas in cities most affected by FY82 cuts, the percentage of funds cut from these programs, and the percentage of the eligible population going unserved; 2) the impact of current economic conditions and record high unemployment on the demand for emergency services; and 3) the impact of state block grants on human services in cities. Fifty-five cities (over 60 percent of all those contacted) responded with information on the status of human services in their community.

- Health, employment and training, and senior service programs were identified as the program areas most severely affected by federal budget cuts in FY82.
- In not one of the human service areas examined was even 50 percent of the eligible population served in FY81 or FY82. Employment and training and social service programs reached the smallest portion of the eligible population - 6 percent and 7.4 percent respectively in FY82.
- Reductions in funds available for programs ranged from a 56 percent cut in employment and training programs and a 42 percent cut in health programs down to a 5 percent cut in senior services.
- Fifty-four percent of the cities reporting were using local general revenues to compensate for federal cuts; 60 percent reported an increase in private sector contributions. Only 12 percent were able to tap other federal sources to try to make up for cuts.
- Seventy-eight percent of the cities identified shelter and 73 percent identified food as the emergency services most in demand in cities. Also in demand were fuel assistance, income assistance and medical care.
- Across all cities submitting information, officials reported that an average of 43 percent of the overall demand for emergency services was met in FY82.
- Two-thirds of the cities reported that the conversion to state block grants in FY82 had adversely affected their local human services programs. Seventy percent of the cities did not feel they had been fairly represented in either the state planning or the state resource allocation processes under the block grants. And three out of four cities did not feel that human services funds had been passed through the state to their local programs in an adequate manner.

- Human services officials characterized the combined effects of the economic downturn, high unemployment and federal program cuts through a number of observations.

  - The emergence of the "new poor" - the people who are losing their jobs, exhausting their financial resources, exhausting their unemployment benefits and losing their homes.

  - The problems of the "working poor" - the people who are losing their public or private jobs and job-related benefits and being forced back on welfare.

  - The breakup of families because of economic problems and the lack of the housing and other support needed to keep them together.

  - The special problems created by the unemployed transient workers who have been drawn to the cities of the West and Southwest in search of jobs.

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the efforts of city officials across the country to meet the pressing needs for human services during the economic decline that occurred in the nation throughout Fiscal Year 1982. The report is based on data supplied by human services officials in 55 cities across the country in October 1982.

Human services are defined as services which provide assistance directly to people. Human services may be preventive or corrective and aim to promote self-sufficiency among those served. While the exact nature of services may vary from one city to another, most cities include in their definition social services, child day care, income assistance, information and referral, employment and training, and services to specific populations such as children, youth, families, elderly and disabled persons.

In each fiscal year since FY80 cities have had to adjust to reductions in federal aid. These federal budget cuts have been severe and have affected the urban infrastructure -- the maintenance of deteriorating streets and bridges, sewer and water systems, sidewalks and buildings -- as well as the programs of direct aid to people in need. Cities have reduced police, fire and sanitation services and have deferred purchases of public transit equipment.

Background

In the summer of 1981, a reconciliation bill governing the funding of federal programs for FY82 was overwhelmingly adopted by both Houses of Congress. In this bill, about 200 domestic spending programs were cut or eliminated. A U.S. Conference of Mayors survey of 100 cities conducted in early FY82 indicated that in response to federal cuts, 60 percent of the cities were laying off workers, that over 40 percent had raised or were planning to raise taxes, and that most were cutting services and deferring capital spending.

Human services programs were especially hard hit in the budget cutting for FY82. In the health area, programs were cut by 30 percent and combined in block grants. Health block grants included the following:

- Maternal and child health - consolidated several programs; authorized $373 million for FY82;
- Preventive health and health services - consolidated eight programs; authorized $95 million for FY82;
- Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health - consolidated three programs; authorized $491 million for FY82; and
- Primary care - included only community health centers; authorized $280 million for FY82.

Remaining as separate categorical programs were: family planning ($130 million); veneral disease control ($40 million); immunization ($29.5 million); tuberculosis control ($9 million); migrant worker health ($43 million); adolescent pregnancy ($30 million); special research ($3 million); and black lung ($5 million).

Separate block grants were established for energy assistance at $1.88 billion (the FY81 level) and for community action at $354 million (a 30 percent cut). The social services block grant was authorized at a level of $2.4 billion (an 18 percent cut). Separate programs included in the reconciliation bill were child abuse prevention ($19 million), developmental disabilities ($61 million), and vocational rehabilitation ($1 billion). Not included in the bill and remaining at their current authorization levels were foster care and adoption assistance, child welfare services and runaway youth.

While a "cap" was not imposed on federal payments to the states for medicaid, as had been proposed by the Administration, those payments were reduced by approximately $1 billion a year for the following three years: 3 percent in FY82, 4 percent in FY83, and 4.5 percent in FY84.

Existing public health service hospitals were to be closed by the end of FY82, or sooner. Those transferred to local control were to remain open through FY82; others were to be closed at the end of FY81.

Cuts of $1.7 billion were authorized for the $12 billion food stamp program, $200 million more than the Administration requested. The cuts were to take about 1 million recipients off the rolls and reduce the benefits of another million. Approximately 22 million Americans were receiving benefits. Among the changes in the program were: restricting eligibility to families earning 130 percent of the poverty level and disallowing eligibility for striking workers who would otherwise qualify.

Cuts of $1.5 billion were made in child nutrition programs funded in FY81 at $4.4 billion. Cuts included school lunch subsidies, special milk, school breakfast, the child care food programs and the women,infants and children program. There was concern that school lunch programs in some financially strapped school districts would end. Subsidies for full-price lunches were to be provided only for children of families earning 130 percent of the poverty level. The price of reduced-price lunches was expected to double.

Cuts of $1 billion were made in the aid to families with dependent children by reducing benefits and tightening eligibility. States were allowed to adopt "workfare" programs, which requires recipients to take jobs in exchange for benefits. The Administration had proposed a mandatory "workfare" program. Striking workers who otherwise qualified were to be denied benefits.

The reconciliation bill put deep cuts in education programs and dramatically restructured many of the programs. About 30 programs of federal aid were consolidated in an elementary and secondary education block grant to states. Large programs of aid to education, such as the Title I program for disadvantaged students, was reduced, but not included in the block grants.

All public service jobs under the CETA program were eliminated for FY82. By the start of the fiscal year, cities had laid off all of their 300,000 public

workers nationwide. Many cities were paying unemployment compensation to these workers; some cities were paying welfare costs. At a time of rising unemployment in cities across the country, former CETA workers were experiencing little success in the job market.

Current Assessment

In cities across the country, human services officials operated programs during FY82 within the constraints of drastically reduced federal budgets, limited state and local revenues, and worsening economic conditions which contributed to client loads. The same operating conditions are expected in FY83. In addition, further cuts totaling $16.9 billion for FY83-85 have been enacted in major entitlement programs including food stamps, medicare, medicaid, and welfare. Most of the other human services programs, including the block grants, are to remain at current levels.

The U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials, representing over 90 cities across the country, recognized a need at the end of FY82 to assess the situation and to make the results of the assessment available to those in the Administration and Congress who will be preparing the federal budget for FY84. The human services leaders are aware that additional domestic budget cuts have already been discussed within the Administration by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. They are aware that political pressures to reduce the projected federal budget deficit will translate into calls by many in Congress to raise taxes and further reduce spending.

Human services administrators in cities across the country enter FY83 with the knowledge that 11 million Americans are unemployed and that another million and a half people have given up their search for a job. Administrators know that economic recovery is not expected to occur in the near term and that the current record high unemployment is likely to continue for many months. And they know that as the benefits run out for more and more unemployed workers concentrated in cities, the demands placed on human service programs by the unemployed workers and their families will stretch those programs far beyond their capacities. Human services officials enter FY83 with the belief that the gap between the service needs of city residents and the service capabilities of local programs will surely widen, that the growing numbers of unemployed and poor people living in America's cities will have fewer services available to them, fewer opportunities for relief from the human misery that accompanies joblessness and poverty.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors and other national organizations representing the governors, the state legislatures and the county governments have called upon the President to halt further domestic budget cuts. The assessment of human services programs in FY82 in this report supports that call. Members of the Conference of City Human Services Officials do not believe that the President and the Congress can permit the experiences of FY82 to continue throughout the current year into FY84.

27-395 O - 84 - 3

SURVEY APPROACH

On September 24, 1982, letters requesting information on the status of human services in cities were sent to officials in 90 cities -- all members of the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials (USCCHSO). The letter indicated that USCCHSO staff would contact the human services officials to obtain their responses to the information request. At close of business on October 4, information had been gathered from 55 cities located in 25 states.

The letter requested information in six categories:

1. What are the three human service program areas (e.g., child day care, senior services, counseling, para-transit, energy assistance, weatherization) in your city that have been most affected by federal budget cuts in FY82?

2. For each program area, please indicate -

   - how many people are eligible for the service in your city;
   - how many people received this service during FY81;
   - how many people received this service during FY82;
   - how many people expected to receive it during FY33;
   - the total amount of funding available for this service in FY81;
   - the total amount available in FY82; and
   - the funding you anticipate for FY83.

3. Which funding sources has your city tapped to compensate for federal budget cuts?

4. What kinds of emergency service needs has your city been asked to meet during the last year?

   What percentage of the demand for emergency services has your city been able to meet?

   What has been the effect on your city budget of providing emergency services?

5. What effect has the consolidation of federal programs into state block grants had on human service programs in your city?

   Under the health and human service block grants, have officials in your city been fairly represented in the state planning and resource allocation process; are funds being passed through in an adequate manner to your city government?

6. Describe a situation affecting a person or a family which best characterizes the impact that the recession/unemployment/budget cut problem has created in your city.

The responses of the 55 cities to these questions are described in this report. The appendix to this document lists the 55 cities which responded to the survey.

Note: Most cities do not have statutory responsibility for the provision of human services to their citizens. Often this responsibility rests with the county or the state government. Many cities, however, have taken on some responsibility for planning, coordinating, and/or administering human services programs for their citizens because local needs would not otherwise be met.

Local human service systems vary greatly from community to community, and so service information available to city human services officials is not uniform. These officials are sensitive to their communities' needs, but often do not have the facts and figures available to verify those needs. For this reason, not all of the officials contacted in this survey were able, within the time constraints given, to respond to all of the questions posed to them.

THE EFFECT OF FEDERAL CUTS ON HUMAN SERVICE PROGRAMS

Service Areas Most Affected

Health, employment and training, and senior service programs head the list of human services programs identified by city human services officials as being most severly affected by federal budget cuts during FY82. The ten program categories most frequently cited by the officials were the following:

Program	Frequency
Health	22
Employment and Training	20
Senior Services	15
Energy Assistance	13
Child Day Care	13
Community Action	8
Weatherization	7
Para-Transit	6
Income Maintenance	6

An additional fourteen program areas, including youth, recreation, programs for disabled persons, legal services and refugee assistance, were also mentioned by human services officials as negatively affected by FY82 cuts.

Among the cities reporting that health programs were most severly affected were Atlantic City, Palo Alto and Pawtucket. Cities citing employment and training as most severly affected included Austin, Cambridge, Chicago, Houston, Dade County, Fort Worth, Gardena, San Diego, Seattle and Tulsa. Cities identifying services for elderly persons as most affected by budget cuts were Arvada, Baltimore, and Denver.

- Atlantic City's rodent control program lost all of its federal funding, but the city intends to continue the program.
- San Antonio is putting $2 million of city funds into energy assistance to compensate for the substantial cuts in federal funds which eliminated the program during FY82.
- Fort Worth's employment and training program went from $10.3 million to $3 million - a decrease of 71 percent. In Syracuse the program went from $5.3 million to $1.9 million - a 64 percent cut.
- Funding to provide social services, congregate meals and home-delivered meals to senior citizens in Baltimore went from $4.1 million in FY81 to $2.7 million in FY83 - a 34 percent cut.

- Denver's homemaker services program for the elderly has been completely eliminated.

The Gap in People Served

A number of cities were able to supply data on both the population served and the program funding for FY81, 82 and 83. Those cities indicated that not one program reached even 50 percent of the eligible population with human services in question during FY81 and FY82. And only one area, energy assistance, was projected to increase to meet 65 percent of need in FY83 (due primarily to one city, San Antonio, which will use $2 million in local funds that are projected to assist 32,000 people). The two programs reaching the smallest percentage of the eligible population were employment and training (reaching 9.7 percent in FY81 and declining to a projected 2.7 percent in FY83) and social services (serving 10.5 percent of the eligible population in FY81 and projected to decline to 7.6 percent in FY83). The table below summarizes the percentage of the eligible population in selected programs reached in FY81 and 82 and expected to be reached in FY83.

Percentage of Eligible Population Served By Program
(Data from Cities Reporting)

Program	Served FY81	Served FY82	Served FY83	Change FY81-83
Employment and Training	10	6	4	-60%
Senior Services	15	15	15	--
Child Day Care	19	16	14	-26%
Health	40	30	36	-10%
Energy Assistance	49	44	65	+33%

Funding Reductions

Reductions in the amount of funds available to operate programs ranged from a 56 percent cut in employment and training programs in FY82 (due in part to the elimination of the public service employment program) and a 42 percent cut in health programs, to a five percent cut in senior services and a three percent cut in para-transit. A 75 percent increase was registered in weatherization* programs, due entirely to a substantial increase in funding in one city, Rockville. (In addition, data on weatherization was available from only a few cities.)

Cities were asked to provide information on the total amount of funding available for a particular service. The figures reported may reflect, therefore, the addition of state and local funds provided to make up for decreases in

* Reported incorrectly as energy assistance in first printing of report.

federal funds. The table below shows the percentage change in funds available in FY82 and FY83, compared with FY81 levels, in selected programs.

Percentage Reduction From FY81 In Program Funds Available
(Data From Cities Reporting)

Program	FY82 Change	FY83 Change
Employment and Training	-56	-68
Senior Services	- 5	-11
Child Day Care	-14	-12
Health	-42	-52
Energy Assistance	-28	-26

COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL CUTS

Cities responding to the survey indicated that they were attempting to use other sources of funding to compensate for federal budget cuts. Twenty-nine of the 54 cities which answered this question (54 percent) indicated that they were using local general revenues to make up for federal budget cuts.

San Antonio was prominent among these, having added $2 million in local revenues to energy assistance programs for FY82. In child day care, San Antonio used local dollars to keep the funding level at $3 million from FY81 to FY83, with only a slight dip in FY82 to $2.7 million. The federal-city funding ratio changed dramatically between FY81 and 83. Federal funds accounted for 87 percent of the program support in FY81, with the remaining 13 percent coming from the city. In FY82, the federal government provided 66 percent of the funds; the city 34 percent. For FY83, the city is expected to provide 58 percent of the funds; the federal government only 42 percent.

Other cities indicating the use of local revenues to compensate for federal cuts in FY82 include Atlantic City, Arvada, Austin, Baltimore, Camden, Chicago, Dade County, Dallas, Evanston, Galesburg, Gary, Manchester, Medford, Melbourne, Paterson, Pittsfield, Rockville, Springfield, Syracuse, Trenton, and West Hartford.

Thirty-three cities, or 60%, reported an increase in private sector contributions in FY82. Included among these cities were Arvada, Austin, Baltimore, Brockton, Cambridge, Chicago, Dade County, Dallas, Evanston, Galesburg, Gary, Holyoke, Manchester, Medford, Pittsfield, Rockville, Seattle, Syracuse, Trenton, and Tulsa.

Only 12 cities, about one in four of those responding to the questions, indicated they had been able to tap other federal resources. Officials in Denver, for example, indicated that they were meeting some day care costs through AFDC work expense deductions, and that some of the elderly were getting homemaker services through medicaid.

Twenty cities reported using Community Development Block Grant funds to support human services programs.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Poor economic conditions have increased the emergency needs of people across the country. According to city officials responding to this survey, the most basic human necessities -- shelter and food -- led the list of the emergency services most needed in cities. Forty-three cities (78 percent) identified shelter as among the services most in demand; forty cities (73 percent) identified food. Fuel assistance followed, with 30 cities (55 percent) identifying this need. Income assistance was reported by 21 cities (38 percent), and medical assistance was cited by 14 (25 percent). Other emergency services sought included transportation, detoxification, employment, weatherization, clothing, crime victims assistance, and day care.

For many cities, emergency services are provided by county governments or nonprofit organizations and churches, rather than by the city government. A number of cities indicated, however, that they were undertaking efforts to meet the increasing need for emergency services:

- Arvada has opened a food bank run by volunteers, and the city is using vacant city-owned housing to provide shelter for transients and people evicted from their homes. In addition, volunteers have cut firewood for distribution at the food bank.

- In one New England city, funds have been raised through the Mayor's office to provide food, heat, and shelter for needy families and individuals.

- Evanston, in conjunction with Evanston Township, is providing food, heat, and housing.

All city officials providing information on emergency services estimated that, on average, 43 percent of the emergency demand was being met in their communities.

Twenty cities estimated that they were able to meet less than half of the demand for emergency services in FY82; 15 said they met more than half the demand.

Cities estimating that they were able to meet a very small percentage (10 percent or less) of the emergency demands included Brockton, Dade County, Gary, Manchester, Memphis, and Scottsdale.

Cities which estimated that most emergency service needs had been met included Camden, Chicago, Madison, Paterson, and San Antonio.

Half of the city officials providing information on emergency services indicated that the provision of these services was having some adverse effect on their city budgets. Included here were Baltimore, Gary, Madison, Manchester, Pittsfield, and three others. Five cities (Atlantic City, Brockton, Trenton, University City, and one other), said it was having a serious adverse effect.

The remaining cities reported moderate adverse effects.

Officials in twenty-four cities, however, reported no effect of emergency services on their budgets due principally to the fact that agencies outside the city government provide emergency services in their communities.

BLOCK GRANT IMPLEMENTATION IN FY82

For most states FY82 was the first year of implementation of the state block grants which consolidated the administration of numerous categorical human services programs at the state level. According to information supplied by city human service officials responding to this survey, most city programs were negatively affected by the conversion to block grants. Most indicated that their cities had not been adequately involved in either the state block grant planning process or the state resource allocation process. They indicated, in addition, that state block grant funds had not been passed through to their cities in an adequate manner

Fully two-thirds of the cities reported that state block grants had some adverse effects on their human service programs. Adversely affected were cities such as Cambridge, Forth Worth, Gary and Houston. Cities reporting at least moderate adverse effects included Baltimore, Brockton, Denver, Holyoke, San Antonio, Trenton and Tulsa. Three cities, Chicago among them, reported that there had been a serious adverse effect on their programs.

Fourteen cities reported that conversion to state block grants had no effect at all on their local programs. Atlantic City, Evanston, Madison, Memphis, Seattle, Syracuse and West Hartford were among these.

Two cities, including the newly-established city of Santee which receives no federal funds for human services (but does receive Community Development Block Grant funds through HUD's Small Cities Program), reported the effect of conversion to state block grants had been positive.

In regard to the representation of cities in the planning associated with the state block grants, 70 percent of the local officials did not believe they had been fairly represented. Among the 14 cities where officials felt they had been represented were Baltimore, Dallas, Denver, Memphis, Pawtucket, Pittsfield and Trenton.

Seventy percent of the city officials responding to the survey said that they were not fairly represented in the state block grant resource allocation process. Here again, 14 cities, including those listed in the preceding paragraph, felt they had been fairly represented at the state level.

About three out of every four cities responding to this inquiry reported that block grant funds had not been passed through the state to their programs in an adequate manner. The 11 cities that felt that their block grant funding was adequately handled included Baltimore, Dade County, Dallas, Denver, Seattle, Trenton and West Hartford.

- Officials in Tulsa indicated that the state uses most of its block grants to fund state agencies.
- In Gary, officials say that Indiana is not passing any funds through to local governments.
- Cambridge officials said they have not been able to obtain any block grant funds through the state.
- In Texas the seven largest cities are trying to influence the state block grant process, but Houston, at least, doesn't expect any change in FY83.
- On the positive side, Evanston's human services administrator said that the mayor is on the Governor's block grant task force and that the city, consequently, is optimistic about its role in the process.

IMPACT OF PROBLEMS ON PEOPLE IN CITIES

Most of the city human services officials supplying information for this report described situations which, in their view, characterized the impact of the combined recession/unemployment/budget-cut problem on the people in their cities. As would be expected, the examples of problem impact varied considerably from one city to another, but a number of common threads ran through them.

In cities across the country there is emerging a group that may be termed the "new poor" -- people who are losing their jobs, exhausting their financial resources, exhausting their unemployment benefits, and losing their homes. These people are coming to human service agencies for the first time, and it is difficult for them to do so. Human service agencies in Evanston report that they have been dealing with serious problems of psychological distress, alcoholism, and even violent behavior among those unable to cope with having to seek help from local agencies. In Arvada, skilled workers are taking any menial jobs that they can find. Even so, large numbers of people are being evicted from their homes. In Gary, officials report that unemployed persons are unable to hang onto their homes in many cases because the unemployment benefits available through the State of Indiana are among the lowest in the nation (maximum $147/week for a family of four or more). Families in Trenton, where unemployment benefits are higher, are facing the same problem; however, officials from two Northeastern cities indicated that many individuals and families, because they cannot afford to do otherwise, now share their homes with others, thus living in overcrowded conditions.

There are also serious problems affecting the "working poor" -- those who are employed in jobs which do not pay enough for them to break the cycle of poverty. In one Northeastern city, minimum wage workers are facing new stricter eligibility requirements for day care services. Those who are forced to remove their children from day care and who are unable to find an affordable alternative are then faced with the prospect of having to give up their jobs. Officials in Seattle speak of the return of many of the working poor to welfare. They described a case of a mother who was in training and receiving day care services; when she lost the training she consequently lost the day care services as well, and presumably any hope of a job.

The lack of jobs and of adequate social services for the jobless is forcing families to break up. In Rockville, family separation has occurred because there is no housing available to out-of-work families with no income. Springfield officials report that unemployed men are abandoning their families so that the families can receive AFDC payments. They report that whole families are now living in rescue missions and that more children are being placed in foster care situations.

Energy problems affecting the unemployed and the poor were cited by cities in the North and Northeast. In Pittsfield, meeting the fuel and shelter assistance needs of unemployed families is placing the greatest burden on

27-395 O - 84 - 4

human service agencies. In Madison, up to 80 percent of the income of poor families is going to meet energy costs. Officials in West Hartford, Camden, and Arvada are tapping private funds and church funds to try to meet the energy assistance needs there. And in Grand Rapids, the United Way, which faces declining contributions, has received 700 requests for energy assistance since July, with many more requests anticipated as winter approaches.

Cities in the Southwest and the West cited special problems that have been created by the influx of unemployed workers from other parts of the country. Lured by the prospect of work in Western cities perceived to be relatively prosperous, thousands of transient individuals and families have placed extraordinary burdens on the human service systems in these cities. Austin officials cope daily with transients living in cars, looking through garbage cans, hanging around in office buildings. In Denver, a young woman who had been sleeping under a bridge was found murdered. Officials there believe that if adequate shelter had been available, this murder would not have occurred. In Houston, transients are living in their cars on freeways and in the parks; vagrancy has increased.

Human services officials in Tulsa describe a "typical" case of a family of three which arrives in the city with $500 in cash and all of their possessions in their car. The husband and wife cannot find work; they cannot find housing. They approach human service agencies for shelter, employment, food and medical services -- primarily prenatal and pediatric care. The agencies meet these needs in some cases; too often, they say, they cannot respond. It is estimated that in Tulsa -- a city which one year ago boasted one of the lowest unemployment rates in the nation -- there may be up to 1,000 people living in cars, trailers and tents, in camping grounds or in the woods, in the warm months and the cold months. There are now between 200 and 300 people living under bridges in the city. There has been a significant increase in domestic violence and in cases of murder involving the transients. They present problems to the hospitals that they approach for medical help, and to the schools which, in order to meet residency requirements for enrollment of the children, are accepting any location (e.g. an abandoned barn) as the family's legal residence. Tulsa officials also describe an increase in suicide attempts among persons, once gainfully employed, who now face desperate financial situations.

On the other side of the coin is the problem of cities abandoned by the unemployed. In Galesburg, because of plant closings and the movement of jobless workers, there are approximately 700 vacant houses.

In cities across the country, human services officials can provide case studies that reflect the serious family and personal problems that have been created or exacerbated by current economic conditions. Baltimore officials describe a mother of four whose job under CETA was discontinued and who, while hospitalized for a six-week period, had to place her children in relatives' homes. Her vacant home was burglarized during this period, and because she was unable to file the necessary papers, her food stamp and AFDC benefits were stopped. With the utilities in her home cut off and facing eviction, she was referred to the mayor's office for special assistance.

In New York, a working mother with two children, paying $175 per month for day care, had her AFDC benefits reduced by 40 percent over a four month period. Total income -- salary and benefits -- for this family dropped to $473 per month. In Syracuse, officials describe a woman, the sole provider for seven children, whose secretarial job with the city government was lost to budget cuts and whose food stamp and day care benefits were lost to revisions in the federal restrictions covering these programs.

APPENDIX: 55 CITIES RESPONDING TO SURVEY

City	Population
Ann Arbor, Michigan	107,316
Atlantic City, New Jersey	40,199
Arvada, Colorado	84,576
Austin, Texas	345,496
Baltimore, Maryland	786,755
Bowie, Maryland	33,695
Bridgeport, Connecticut	142,546
Brockton, Massachusetts	95,172
Cambridge, Massachusetts	95,322
Camden, New Jersey	84,910
Chicago, Illinois	3,005,072
Dade County, Florida	1,625,979
Dallas, Texas	904,078
Denver, Colordao	491,396
Evanston, Illinois	73,706
Fort Worth, Texas	385,141
Fridley, Minnesota	30,228
Galesburg, Illinois	35,305
Gardena, California	45,165
Gary, Indiana	151,953
Grand Rapids, Michigan	181,843
Holyoke, Massachusetts	44,678
Houston, Texas	1,594,086
Lafayette, Louisiana	81,961
Madison, Wisconsin	170,616
Manchester, Connecticut	49,761
Medford, Massachusetts	58,076
Melbourne, Florida	46,536
Memphis, Tennessee	646,356
Middletown, Ohio	43,719
Minneapolis, Minnesota	370,951
New Orleans, Louisiana	557,482
New York, New York	7,071,030
Palo Alto, California	55,225
Paterson, New Jersey	137,970
Pawtucket, Rhode Island	71,204
Pittsfield, Massachusetts	51,974
Poughkeepsie, New York	29,757
Rialto, California	35,615
Rockville, Maryland	43,811
San Antonio, Texas	785,410
San Diego, California	875,504
Santee, California	45,000
Savannah, Georgia	141,634
Scottsdale, Arizona	88,364
Seattle, Washington	493,846
Springfield, Massachusetts	152,319
Syracuse, New York	170,105
Taunton, Massachusetts	45,001
Trenton, New Jersey	92,124
Tulsa, Oklahoma	360,919
University City, Missouri	42,738
Washington, D.C.	637,651
West Hartford, Connecticut	61,301
Wichita, Kansas	279,272

Hunger in American Cities

Eight Case Studies

June, 1983

United States
Conference of Mayors

FOREWORD

This report provides information on conditions relating to hunger in eight cities and the local efforts being made to cope with the resulting problems. It was made possible by a grant from the American Can Company Foundation and was written by Conference staff members Lilia M. Reyes and Laura DeKoven Waxman.

Thanks go to William S. Woodside, Chairman of the American Can Company, and to Peter Goldberg, Director of the American Can Company Foundation, for their support and advice in this effort.

Thanks also go to the mayors and other officials of the eight cities -- Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, New Orleans, Oakland, Rochester, and San Antonio. Through their cooperation, assistance, and the considerable time they were willing to devote to this effort, we were able to assemble the information needed to prepare this publication.

John J. Gunther
Executive Director
U.S. Conference of Mayors

June, 1983

INTRODUCTION

"Hunger is perhaps the most prevalent and detrimental problem facing American cities today. The face of hunger has changed as the economy has worsened, and for the first time we are seeing families who have always had a breadwinner forced into a situation with nowhere to turn."

Mayor Coleman A. Young of Detroit
President, U.S. Conference of Mayors
Conference on Hunger and Unemployment
Michigan State University, March 29, 1983

In October, 1982, the Conference of Mayors brought the shortage of emergency services -- food, shelter, medical care, energy assistance -- to national attention through a survey on the combined impact of federal budget cuts, economic conditions and high unemployment on people in cities. That report, which was based on information provided by human services officials in 55 cities, found that:

- In not one of the human service areas examined was even 50 percent of the eligible population served in FY81 or FY82.
- Seventy-eight percent of the cities identified shelter and 73 percent identified food as the emergency service most in demand.
- Across all cities submitting information, officials reported that an average of 43 percent of the overall demand for emergency services was met in FY82.
- Human services officials characterized the combined effects of the economic downturn, high unemployment and federal program cuts through a number of observations:
  - -- The emergence of the "new poor" - the people who are losing their jobs, exhausting their financial resources, exhausting their unemployment benefits and losing their homes.
  - -- The problems of the "working poor" - the people who are losing their public or private jobs and job-related benefits and being forced back on welfare.
  - -- The breakup of families because of economic problems and the lack of the housing and other support needed to keep them together.

-- The special problems created by the unemployed transient workers who have been drawn to the cities of the West and Southwest in search of jobs.

Following the publication of the report, many of the nation's Mayors became increasingly concerned about the plight of the growing numbers of homeless and hungry people in their communities. On November 22, 1982, New Orleans Mayor Ernest N. Morial, who chairs the Conference's Standing Committee on Health, Education, Employment, and Human Services, convened the Committee leadership in an emergency meeting on emergency service needs. The Committee made recommendations to Congress and the Administration for specific actions needed to avert a national tragedy that winter. A number of national service organizations and food advocacy groups participated in the meeting with the Mayors and have supported and assisted in the Conference's efforts.

On December 7, 1982, Detroit Mayor Coleman Young, President of the Conference of Mayors, declared a "State of Emergency" for his City and announced a survival program to help destitute Detroiters avert starvation and freezing through the coming "winter of crisis." Later that same week, at a large national meeting of Mayors and business leaders, the Vice-Chairman of the Atlantic Richfield Company, Edward M. Benson, echoed Mayor Young's concern when he acknowledged that cities face urgent needs for emergency aid, and that the private sector should share in the responsibility to meet those needs. On December 15, 1982, Salt Lake City Mayor Ted Wilson testified on behalf of the Conference of Mayors before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development at the first hearing on homelessness held in Congress since the Great Depression. Mayor Wilson talked about the great increase in homeless and hungry people in his City and termed the situation across the country "a national tragedy and a national disgrace."

Although there are several emergency problems of concern to the Mayors at this time, hunger is probably the most prevalent and the most insidious. From all accounts, the numbers of people, including families with children who have little or nothing to eat, have grown tremendously. In response, new soup kitchens and food cupboards have opened in many communities and many such facilities already in existence find they are serving more and more families with children.

While much media attention has been directed to the reemergence of hunger in America, little uniform information has been available. For this reason, the U.S. Conference of Mayors requested and received support from the American Can Company Foundation to undertake a brief examination of hunger in American cities. This report contains case studies on the problems of hunger in eight cities: Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, New Orleans, Oakland, Rochester, and San Antonio. The following section contains findings based on the information gathered from the eight cities.

FINDINGS

A. Despite differing local economic conditions and rates of unemployment, all of the cities examined experienced a recent and significant increase in the demand for emergency food assistance. Local officials use different indicators to illustrate this increase:

- In Detroit there was an almost five-fold increase in households served by emergency food programs from 1980 to 1982.
- San Antonio officials expect requests for food assistance during 1983 from five times as many people as were served in 1982.
- Requests for assistance in Cleveland increased by 112 percent from 1981 to 1982.
- In New Orleans there was an increase of 222 percent when the first nine months of 1982 are compared with the same period in 1981 in calls for food assistance made to the Mayor's Citizen Action Center.
- Almost twice as much food was distributed in Denver in 1982 than was distributed in 1981.
- In Rochester the number of soup kitchens increased by 75 percent in the last year.
- Oakland saw a one-third increase in persons served by food programs during 1982.
- In Nashville there was a 75 percent increase in applicants for family assistance and a 66 percent increase in food bank deliveries from 1981 to 1982.

B. All eight cities agree that unemployment is a primary cause of increased problems of hunger. The official unemployment rates in March, 1983 of the responding cities range from 21.2 percent in Detroit to 7.1 percent in Nashville. Other factors which city officials mention specifically include:

- cutbacks in federal funds (Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, New Orleans, Oakland, and Rochester);
- transients who come to the city seeking jobs and do not find them (Denver, Nashville, New Orleans, and San Antonio); and
- the high cost of necessities such as shelter, food, and energy (Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Nashville, Oakland, Rochester, and San Antonio).

C. The cities identified several different mechanisms for

organizing their local efforts, for identifying the problems, and for responding to them:

- In Denver, Detroit, and Oakland, the Mayor has appointed a task force or local group to examine the problems of hunger and develop a local response. The Cuyahoga Emergency Funders Group performs a similar function in Cleveland, and has raised $1.2 million to respond to local problems.

- All eight cities mention local or statewide coalitions that work to coordinate food assistance programs and/or serve as advocates on issues pertaining to hunger.

- Two cities, Denver and Detroit, have established hotlines to provide information on food assistance programs and to respond to individual needs. All of the other cities indicated that they were using existing information and referral services to provide information on food assistance programs as well as other emergency services.

- Six cities -- Cleveland, Denver, Nashville, New Orleans, Rochester, and San Antonio -- cite food banks in their community that are providing food to hunger programs and, in some cases, directly to individuals. Oakland is now developing plans for a food bank. In Detroit, the City's Neighborhood Services Department is providing this service through its Emergency Food Program.

D. There was wide variance in the number of food assistance sites (including both soup kitchens and food cupboards) providing services in the cities:

- San Antonio indicates that 105 organizations and 30 neighborhood centers are providing emergency food services.

- Detroit officials have identified over 100 church groups -- in addition to a number of other public and private agencies -- operating emergency food and meal programs.

- In Cleveland, 78 food sites provide assistance to city residents.

- There are 100 food banks in the Denver metropolitan area -- 50 in Denver alone -- and at least 26 facilities serving meals.

- In the greater Rochester area there are seven soup kitchens and 16 food cupboards.

- New Orleans cites at least ten agencies providing emergency food services throughout the city.

27-395 O - 84 - 5

- There are 13 emergency food facilities in Alameda County, California; six of these are in Oakland. In addition, several other voluntary and religious agencies are providing food services in Oakland.

E. All eight cities have received some U.S. Department of Agriculture surplus commodities. Rochester, however, notes concerns about the expense involved and the great distance that must be travelled by local providers to obtain the food from a central distribution site. Officials in Nashville believe that they were only able to get food distributed to their community after the Mayor pressed U.S. Department of Agriculture officials in Washington and Atlanta for this.

F. Three cities -- New Orleans, Oakland, and San Antonio -- indicate that they need more food for distribution than is currently available. Denver, Detroit, Oakland, and Rochester all need more facilities to serve meals. Additional storage and distribution facilities and equipment are needed in Detroit, Nashville, Rochester, and San Antonio.

G. Five of the eight cities are not able to serve all of those in need of food assistance:

- In Detroit, only a small fraction of the population in need is being served.

- Thirty-two percent of the provider agencies in the Denver area are not always able to meet the need; ten percent are never able to meet the need.

- Oakland estimates that at least 30,000 people who are in need of food assistance are not receiving it.

- While San Antonio is able to provide food to all emergency cases, i.e., those who have run out of food completely, officials estimate that as many as 100,000 people may need supplemental food, but only half are receiving it.

- Although Nashville officials do not have numerical estimates, they know that many people are undernourished and some are stealing to eat.

- Three cities -- Cleveland, New Orleans, and Rochester -- are currently able to meet the demand. However, Cleveland officials point out that this situation is only temporary; and, New Orleans is able to meet current demand only by stretching the food supply to its limit, leaving no reserves at all to meet additional demand.

CASE STUDIES

CLEVELAND

Mayor: George V. Voinovich
Population: 573,822
Population in Poverty 22%
Minority Population: 49.5%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 18.1%
3/82 -- 15.3%

Problems

From 1978 to 1982 emergency food requests in Cleveland increased by 219 percent, with an increase of 112 percent from 1981 to 1982 alone. Based on a survey conducted by the Federation of Community Planning, those served by emergency food programs grew from 47,000 in 1980 to 75,000 in 1982. An additional 35,000 to 40,000 people who requested food were not able to receive it during 1982. Since then, most of these people have received assistance, largely through efforts undertaken by the Cuyahoga Emergency Funders Group, a local organization established last fall in response to growing problems of hunger.

Federation officials attribute the tremendous rise in emergency food requests to:

- A 116 percent increase in the number of unemployed persons from 1978 to 1982;
- A 207 percent increase in the number of AFDC and general relief recipients for the same period; and
- The reduction or termination of public assistance benefits for more than 5000 people.

At the end of 1982, the Salvation Army had seen:

- A 56 percent increase in the number of families assisted;
- A 209 percent increase in the number of bagged can goods distributed;
- An 81 percent increase in the checks and vouchers issued; and
- An 80 percent increase in the total number of persons assisted.

Other statistics support this trend. The Hunger Task Force of the Greater Cleveland Interchurch Council saw requests for assistance almost double from 89,000 between January and June, 1982 to 172,000 from July to December of the same year. Requests rose 150 percent during the past winter alone. The St. Vincent DePaul Society had a 40 percent increase in requests from 77,000 for the first half

of 1982 to 108,000 for the second half. The Salvation Army, Interchurch Council and St. Vincent DePaul Society are the three main providers of emergency food in Cleveland.

The number of persons receiving food stamps has risen 13 percent, from approximately 159,000 in April to close to 180,000 in April, 1983. Part of this increase is due to the expiration of unemployment compensation benefits, which has forced some beneficiaries into the food stamp program.

The general decline of the steel and auto industries has not only reduced the number of jobs available but also the local tax base. These industries comprise a large part of the local job base and the ramifications of their decline are felt on secondary industries, such as car radio antennas and rubber window stripping, which suffer when there are major industrial layoffs as well. When coupled with these local economic conditions, cutbacks in federal social programs such as food stamps have clearly had a negative impact on the problems of food and hunger.

Responses

In the Fall of 1982, it was apparent to a number of local officials that the demands for food and shelter had grown significantly and would continue to do so for the foreseeable future. Local foundations expressed an interest in helping to solve the food crisis. At the same time, neighborhood advocacy groups began pressing for assistance with the shelter problem. Cleveland's Mayor, George Voinovich, worked with the foundations and private organizations and successfully convinced them to respond together to the dual needs of food and shelter. To address these issues in a coordinated fashion through a single entity, the Cuyahoga Emergency Funders Group (CEFG) was formed. It now includes representatives of major corporations, private foundations, religious groups, and city and county governments. CEFG members donated $1.2 million for emergency housing and food. Funding from CEFG goes to specific hunger centers operated by the three principal food service groups and to the Greater Cleveland Food Bank. The money was distributed after a careful assessment was made of the needs in the various areas of the city and the applicants' ability to provide the services efficiently. By consolidating all efforts under this umbrella, money and talent were gathered and utilized in the most timely and efficient fashion. There was little duplication of effort on behalf of individual agencies seeking to help poor and unemployed people, and the dollars raised were distributed in an equitable manner.

The Cuyahoga Emergency Funding Group provides support to 47 food sites operated by the Salvation Army, St. Vincent DePaul and the Interchurch Council's Hunger Task Force. There are also about 30 independently operated soup kitchens and food distribution centers in the greater Cleveland area. New voucher and food distribution centers and soup kitchens have been established recently in suburban communities and working class neighborhoods, areas previously unserved and now in need of service.

The City of Cleveland has provided $220,000 in funding from its Community Development Block Grant to help support a variety of different kinds of food assistance programs, including:

- Salvation Army programs;
- the Greater Cleveland Food Bank;
- the Cleveland Summer Sprout Program, an urban gardening project which provides some of its produce to the Greater Cleveland Food Bank;
- the Glenville Opportunity Center, to operate a food co-op;
- Operation Alert, to operate a food distribution center; and
- Wade Park Cluster, to operate a food distribution center.

The Federation for Community Planning is a nonprofit organization of community leaders which performs planning and research functions and has done a lot of work in the area of hunger. In addition, the Federation maintains an information and referral service to direct persons in need of emergency food to facilities that can provide it. It has also provided the Cuyahoga Emergency Funders Group significant staff and research assistance.

Unmet Needs

Because of the tremendous local efforts that have been made in Cleveland to draw all sectors of the community together to respond to the problem of hunger, primarily through the Cuyahoga Emergency Funders Group, local officials feel that currently they are meeting the demand. However, Cleveland's ability to keep up with the demand after 1983 is indeed uncertain.

DENVER

Mayor: William McNichols, Jr.
Population: 492,365
Population in Poverty: 13.4%
Minority Population: 33%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 7.4%
3/82 -- 6.4%

The Problem

The recent dramatic increase in the number of people requesting emergency food assistance in Denver is a clear indication of the growing problem of hunger in the City. According to Denver's Food Bank Coalition, for example, the value of food distributed through local food banks in 1982 was $627,246, almost double the amount ($325,852) spent in 1981. The Central Denver/Episcopal Community Services alone, one of the many agencies assisting hungry people in Denver, reported serving 30,000 persons in 1982, a 206 percent increase since 1979. In the week of February 22, 1983, 56,624 allotments of cheese and butter were distributed in Denver, an increase of 20,000 in the number of households served through the program only a few months earlier. While many people have been cut off the public assistance rolls due to recent changes in eligibility requirements for food stamps, Denver's AFDC-Unemployed Parent Program reported that the number of persons applying for assistance more than doubled from 213 in 1982 to 444 in January, 1983. Many of the recipients indicate they were not able to pay for sufficient quantities of food even with public assistance.

There are a number of factors which have contributed to the growing problem of hungry people in the Denver metropolitan area. At a time when nearly 12 million workers are unemployed in the United States, Denver's relatively low level of unemployment (7.4 percent in contrast with 10.2 percent nationwide) has attracted an influx of people from other parts of the country who have been lured by the prospect of work. For most of them, however, the hope of finding employment and a better life has not been fulfilled and, like many of the City's long-time residents who have recently been laid off from their workplace, these transients often find themselves without a job and unable to support themselves.

Although reduced interest rates during the close of 1982 helped to slow the rate of inflation in the country, the cost of food, shelter, and energy continued to rise. The rate of inflation for food costs alone in Denver in January, 1983, was 2.3 percent. Low-cost housing in Denver has become virtually nonexistent. Therefore, the amount of funds available to low-income people for other essentials, such as food, has been drastically reduced. Applicants for Denver's public assistance program, for example, report shelter costs in excess of the total amount provided through the categorical program. Aggravating the problem of people who already lacked sufficient funds to

purchase food, the winter of 1982-1983 was one of the most severe the city had ever experienced. Whatever money many people had available, had to be used to pay for shelter and heat.

Responses

As the urgent and growing problem of homeless and hungry people in Denver became known, local public and private agencies as well as many members of the community came forth to assist in meeting the immediate needs for food and shelter. The following are specific efforts undertaken in Denver to deal with the problem of hunger.

- In early 1982, Mayor William McNichols met with leaders of several religious denominations and directors of various city agencies and established a task force on the problem of hunger and homelessness in Denver. The task force was charged with studying the problems of people in need of emergency services and developing recommendations to address those problems. In conjunction with the Mayor's Office and the City's Department of Social Services, the task force has been working closely with churches and private human service agencies in Denver, informing them about the various needs of poor and displaced people, and services available in the community to address those needs.

- New positions and administrative responsibilities have been established within the City's structure to respond more effectively to the problems of hungry and homeless people in Denver. A new division - the Special Projects Division - was created within the Department of Social Services to deal specifically with the need for emergency food and shelter of people in the city and to develop resources necessary to address those needs. A new full time position called the "General Assistance Specialist" was created to focus attention on the emergency needs of people applying for public assistance. Another full time position was assigned to the General Assistance Unit to coordinate the surplus food distribution program. In addition, the Department of Social Services provides computer services, postage, equipment, and supplies to the food distribution program.

- Emergency shelter and meal services provided by the Department of Social Services through hotels, boarding homes and restaurants, have been substantially increased. Referrals to these services are available through the Police Department after hours. Information regarding the availability of emergency services is sent to community service agencies such as the American Red Cross, Salvation Army, Volunteers of America, Travelers' Aid, and others. The amount of food certificates made available to needy persons through the Sarah Brown Fund, a Department of Social Services employees benevolent organization, has also been increased.

- There are approximately 100 food banks and pantries operating in the Denver metropolitan area, with about 50 located within the City. Some of these banks have been serving hungry people for many years; many others, however, have been established recently in response to growing demand for assistance.

- Free meals are provided to needy persons at various times of the day at food centers located throughout the City by religious and voluntary agencies. Over 1,000 persons use these services every day.

- Much of the food provided at the various food banks and centers is made available by the Colorado Food Clearinghouse, a nonprofit national corporation which maintains a large warehouse in Denver. The Clearinghouse, which charges 10 cents per pound to cover administrative costs, distributes surplus food and donated items to 69 food banks, and 26 facilities serving free meals to needy persons in Denver.

- Denver Opportunity Inc., the local community action agency, has been especially active in the distribution of products made available by the stores and wholesalers to the food banks.

- The Colorado Food and Nutrition Program, an agency of Denver Opportunity Inc., maintains a hot line (444-MEAL) to assist persons in need of food. Persons calling the hot line are referred to the food bank or center located nearest to them. If not yet receiving food stamps, callers are given information about the program and referred to the appropriate office where they can apply for assistance.

- Denver's news media has contributed significantly to raising public awareness of the problem of hunger in the city. One television station, for example, developed a documentary on the problem. Another conducted a drive for canned food that resulted in the contribution by the public of tons of food which was distributed through the Salvation Army.

  Both the Rocky Mountain News and the Denver Post, the two local newspapers, have provided outreach publicity for programs serving the needy. Announcements and articles concerning cheese and butter distributions have appeared in both papers.

- A statewide conference was held in Denver in February, 1983, which brought together organizations and individuals concerned with hunger and food distribution in Colorado.

- A booklet entitled "Help! in the Winter," which lists agencies in the city providing meals and food items at no cost is available through the Travelers' Aid Society. The booklet was made possible by a grant from the Junior League of Denver, Inc.

- Volunteers play a major role in the operations of many of the programs providing emergency food assistance in Denver. For example, 120 members of Denver Retired Volunteers of America donated approximately 3,000 hours of service for cheese and butter distributions in March and April of this year. Central Denver/Episcopal Community Services used 60 volunteers in 1982 who gave a total of 24,960 hours to distribute food items to persons in need.

Unmet Needs

At the statewide conference on hunger held last February in Denver, a survey was conducted of 119 agencies that provide emergency food service in the Denver metropolitan area. Fifty percent of the agencies participating in the survey reported being able to meet current needs; 32 percent indicated they are not always able to meet demands for services; and, 10 percent indicated they have never been able to meet the needs of people requesting assistance.

Of all the various segments of the population in need of emergency services in Denver, single employable adults and childless couples, are facing the greatest difficulties in obtaining the assistance they urgently need. Since service agencies generally tend to give priority to assisting families with children, the elderly, and disabled persons, this segment of the needy population often falls through the cracks of emergency service programs. A substantial number of single adults and families without children have requested assistance from the Denver Department of Social Services but do not meet the programs' eligibility requirements. They are referred to private church groups or other social agencies in the City that provide meals or food items.

27-395 O - 84 - 6

DETROIT

Mayor: Coleman A. Young
Population: 1,203,339
Population in Poverty: 22% (34% on public assistance)
Minority Population: 68%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 21.2%
3/83 -- 22.2%

Problems

On December 7, 1982, Mayor Coleman A. Young declared a "state of emergency" for the City of Detroit and announced a survival program to help destitute Detroiters avert starvation and freezing through the coming "winter of crisis." "The massive recent increases in the number of poverty-stricken citizens who are unable to feed themselves or to find adequate relief from the cold demand immediate attention," the Mayor said. "The need has reached crisis proportions."

Mayor Young was responding to the tremendous problems facing his City. The following indicators give some idea of their magnitude:

- A five-fold increase in the number of households served by sampled emergency food providers between 1980 and 1982;
- A 426 percent increase in emergency food providers since 1974;
- Two-hundred-fifty calls for food per day to the Mayor's Emergency Food Hot Line, over 26,000 in all since it was established in September, 1982;
- An actual unemployment rate of 25 percent;
- Twenty-five hundred persons exhausting unemployment benefits every month;
- Thirty-five to fifty thousand families receiving surplus cheese, butter and milk every month;
- Two-thirds of those senior citizens in poverty in need of home delivered meals; and
- An infant morbidity rate of 34 percent in impacted poverty areas.

City officials identify as major factors behind this situation:

- the length and depth of the economic recession in the auto and related industries;

- a decline in government revenues;
- reductions in government funding;
- high food costs;
- high health care costs and a loss of group coverage;
- high housing and transportation costs.

Those in need of emergency food services in Detroit include:

- senior citizens and disabled people on fixed incomes;
- people who have exhausted or are ineligible for unemployment benefits;
- unemployed minority group members, especially youths;
- unemployed auto workers -- both blue and white collar;
- female heads-of-households and displaced homemakers;
- welfare recipients;
- dependent children of the poor and unemployed; and
- central city residents.

Detroit has approximately 410,000 persons on public assistance, one-third of the population. City officials estimate that all of them at one time or another, are in need of emergency food services. Currently, 150,000 people receive food stamps.

Responses

In response to Mayor Young's declaration of a "state of emergency," which was followed several weeks later by a state hunger emergency proclamation by the Governor of Michigan, a substantial effort has been mounted by both the public and the private sectors in Detroit.

Two independent research groups were formed to study the problem. The first was charged with developing recommendations for quick action. It studied the immediate effects of the continuing economic depression upon unemployment, health problems, welfare caseloads, and hunger and malnutrition. This group used data currently available from the administrative records of agencies struggling to cope with these problems. The second group is continuing to study these problems in greater depth through a sample survey now underway.

The City's Neighborhood Services Department is the focal point of city government activities. It has initiated a variety of services this year to deal with hunger and malnutrition. They include:

- Establishment and operation of the Mayor's Emergency Food Hot Line through which referrals are made to emergency meal providers, clothing suppliers, and shelters (99 percent of the calls are food related);
- Monthly distribution of USDA surplus foods;
- Certification and distribution of food stamps;
- Support of food co-ops;
- Collection and distribution of emergency food;
- Distribution of food donated by foreign countries;
- Distribution of foods collected through a gleaners surplus food program;
- Support for the start up of soup kitchens;
- Grantsmanship assistance for emergency food programs; and
- Operation of a weekly food donation and distribution program for all city employees.

Through the City's Emergency Food Program, individuals who call the Hot Line and are eligible are scheduled, based on the severity of need, to pick up food. The food comes from various sources, including city employees, the gleaners food bank, the private sector and foreign countries.

Many private organizations, often in conjunction with the City, have also undertaken efforts to respond to the problems of hunger in Detroit:

- The United Auto Workers and General Motors Corporation have initiated a food collection and corporate matching food donation program. The food is distributed through the Neighborhood Services Department, the local United Fund agency, and United Community Services' grantee agencies;
- Over 100 Detroit church groups are now operating emergency food and/or meal programs;
- Focus: HOPE provides prescription foods to 35,000 persons per month and distributes surplus commodities on a daily basis;
- The Southeastern Michigan Food Coalition advocates for, coordinates and supports local food collection and distribution programs;

- The Automobile Association of America runs Operation Food Basket, through which it collects food from employees and clients and contributes it to the City's emergency food program operated by the Neighborhood Services Department, and to other food pantries in the Detroit area.

- Local food retailers contribute food to the City's emergency food program.

The media has played an important role in educating the public about the problems of hunger in Detroit and in encouraging contributions to the efforts. The Mayor's and Governor's emergency proclamations especially generated substantial media coverage and brought much visibility to the issue. Many of the stories done on the problem mention the Mayor's Emergency Food Hot Line's telephone number. Additionally, public service announcements are run daily on virtually all commercial television stations.

Volunteers are an important part of Detroit's program. They staff and operate the Hot Line and provide most of the services offered through the City's Emergency Food Program. They also do much of the work required to distribute the USDA surplus commodities. The City has contributed substantial funding, using its Community Services Block Grant, to purchase food and provide the staffing required to organize and administer the City's Emergency Food Program. Private funding comes from companies and organizations, such as General Motors and AAA, and from individuals who call the Hot Line wishing to contribute money. The Mayor's Emergency Relief Fund was set up to provide a vehicle for these contributions.

Unmet Needs

Emergency food services in Detroit are estimated to reach only a small fraction of the total population in need of them. Most of these services are intended to provide at most a three or four day supply of food, and only for the most needy. City officials indicate that in most cases such assistance is inadequate to meet the continuing needs of those who frequently have to wait for weeks to qualify for public assistance or who have no public assistance at all available to them.

Despite the tremendous response to the problems of hunger that has been made by all sectors in Detroit, City officials identify a number of areas in which they need addititonal help. To handle perishable commodities, such as cheese and butter, more private sector contributions of refrigerated warehouse space, refrigerated trucks for transportation, and commercial coolers to ease handling are needed. The City needs additional soup kitchens, ones that offer services seven days a week. Finally, the City would like to establish emergency food distribution outlets in its four neighborhood service centers, if sufficient food supplies could be obtained to stock them.

NASHVILLE

Mayor: Richard H. Fulton
Population: 477,811
Population in Poverty: 12%
Minority Population: 21.8%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 7.1%
3/82 -- 6.9%

Problems

The need for emergency food assistance in Nashville has increased significantly, as evidenced by the greater number of people asking for help from local public and private agencies:

- The Metropolitan Social Services Family Assistance Program, which provides general assistance for food and other basic necessities, accepted 151 applications in January, 1983, a 75 percent increase over the number accepted during that month one year earlier. The agency spent $41,560 in monthly cash grants to these and other families in January, 1983, as compared with the $33,774 spent in January, 1982.

- The number of women and children participating in the Metropolitan Health Department's Supplemental Food Program has also increased by more than one-third, from about 9,000 in November, 1981, to approximately 12,500 in February, 1983. Unless the State Department of Agriculture increases the caseload allowed for Nashville-Davidson County for this program, as requested by the Health Department, some of these women and children will no longer receive the assistance they need.

- The Second Harvest Food Bank distributed nearly 1,500 food boxes in December, 1982, a 66 percent increase over 1981. Since then, the Bank's distribution has continued to increase substantially. The number of agencies and sites which participate in the Bank has also more than doubled, from approximately 50 in 1981 to 122 in 1982.

- The summer food service program operated by the Metropolitan Action Commission (the local community action agency) saw a 33 percent increase in the number of children served between 1981 and 1982.

According to local officials, the increased demand for food assistance can be attributed to a number of factors which have led to the loss or reduction of income or other needed resources. They include increasing unemployment, family breakdown and separation, loss of child care resources, ineligibility for public assistance programs and insufficient benefit levels, loss of federal Social Security or

SSI benefits, ineligibility or exhausted unemployment compensation benefits, and increased costs of food and other necessities. The recent increase in the number of people who have moved to Nashville from other areas in search of a job is also seen as a contributing factor to the growing problem of hunger in the City. These transients, many of whom are in need of emergency services such as food and shelter, are often ineligible to participate in federal programs because they lack a permanent address.

Although economic conditions have worsened for many people, the number of persons benefitting from AFDC and food stamps, which provide assistance for basic necessities, has decreased due to the tightening of eligibility requirements by the federal and state governments. Between September, 1981, and November, 1982, the number of households in the Nashville Metropolitan area that were eligible for the Food Stamp Program dropped by 18 percent, from 24,139 to 19,794. The number of families receiving AFDC decreased from 7,358 to 6,185 during the same period. Thus, increasing numbers of people have been forced to seek food and other types of assistance from alternate sources.

Of those people applying for help from the Metropolitan Social Services Family Assistance Program, approximately half are Black. Nearly half of the applicants in February, 1983, were male heads of households, many of whom are 40 to 50 years old and have limited education and job skills. According to Health Department officials, an increasing number of the "new poor," formerly middle-class families who are now experiencing greater economic difficulties, are requesting assistance from the Supplemental Food Assistance Program.

Responses

Metropolitan Nashville relies upon a combination of federal and local programs, both public and private, to meet the increased demand for food assistance:

- The Second Harvest Food Bank provides emergency assistance with prepared food boxes. Each box contains enough food to feed three people over a three-day period. Referrals are accepted from government agencies and other participating organizations. Second Harvest, a collaborative effort between the public and private sector to collect and distribute food in Metro Nashville, receives support from the Metropolitan Action Commission and also relies upon contributions to maintain its activities.

- A number of private, voluntary agencies including the Red Cross, Travelers' Aid, the Salvation Army, and the Nashville Union Mission provide emergency food assistance to needy people in Nashville.

- The Metropolitan Action Commission has several programs which aid in the provision of food. These include:

  -- Community gardening;

  -- Community cannery;

  -- Summer lunch;

  -- Transportation of elderly persons to congregate meal sites;

  -- Head Start;

  -- Surplus dairy commodities distribution;

  -- Information and referral service; and

  -- A nutrition hot line.

- The Metropolitan Social Services Family Assistance Program provides temporary financial assistance to persons in need due to circumstances beyond their control. Qualified applicants receive cash assistance to be used as they determine for food, shelter or other basic necessities. The money is usually provided within three days from the time the application is filed. Persons found ineligible for Family Assistance are referred to other social agencies for assistance. The 1982-1983 budget for cash assistance is approximately $400,000. With the exception of $35,000 in reimbursements for interim SSI payments, the budget is financed with local taxes.

  Metropolitan Social Services provides financial assistance to qualified AFDC applicants during the 45 day waiting period but terminates support once ADFC benefits begin. It also provides financial assistance to SSI applicants while their forms are being processed.

- The Metropolitan Social Services Nutrition Program provides both congregate meals and meals-on-wheels to elderly persons. An average of 1,200 people participate daily in these two programs. Almost 100 elderly persons are on a waiting list to receive the home-delivered meals.

- The Metropolitan Health Department Supplemental Food Program provides food commodities to low-income pregnant and post-partum women and to children under the age of six. In February, 1983, 12,517 people were served through this program.

Special efforts, led by Nashville's Mayor Dick Fulton, were made to distribute surplus cheese and butter to Nashville area residents in February, 1983. Despite the fact that 1.6 million pounds of butter and 3.6 million pounds of cheese were stored in Metro Nashville, the federal government told Mayor Fulton it would not be possible to distribute it to local residents. After pressing federal officials in Atlanta and Washington, surplus commodities were made available, although ironically not from the stockpiles in Metro Nashville.

Distribution was coordinated by the Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency with the help of volunteers from all parts of the Metro Nashville community, including church groups, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, college organizations, businesses, individuals and several other Metro Government departments. Several local food distributors assisted by making trucks available for pick-up and delivery of the butter and cheese. Fast food restaurants provided food for the volunteers.

In testimony before the House Budget Committee on March 1, 1983, several days following the distribution, Mayor Fulton related his personal experience with the distribution of surplus commodities:

> "Last Wednesday we distributed surplus cheese and butter to 32,000 families. Seventy-five thousand pounds of cheese went to people who live in public housing and housing for the elderly -- those who qualify. And, on Saturday, we distributed the food to unemployed persons at three distribution points. In all, 159,000 people benefitted from the two day effort.
>
> Time after time, the people who came up to get their cheese were people with whom I had gone to school. It was embarrassing for them, and it was embarrassing for me. I didn't stay there long because I did not want to embarrass them."

In the Fall of 1981, Mayor Dick Fulton appealed to Nashville's 740 churches and others in the private sector to work in partnership with Metro government in addressing the growing human service needs, including the need for food and shelter. Since then, a strong collaborative relationship has developed between the public and private sectors which has resulted in a number of efforts to assist the needy. "Help Line," a networking system that coordinates activities related to food assistance among local churches and social service agencies, is an example of such efforts.

Church participation has included the direct provision of food, participating in the establishment of the "Help Line," and filling in the gaps when persons meet their quotas and cannot receive additional assistance at the various food banks and centers.

The business sector has provided funding and donations for various programs, including the community garden, and has provided food directly to those in need. Dairy companies have provided refrigeration, storage and transportation for surplus commodities.

With support from Nashville Metropolitan Government and the State of Tennessee, a program was established in 1982 designed to coordinate resources, both public and private, to assist elderly persons in 15 neighborhoods in Nashville. The program, "The Good Samaritan," focuses on meeting the nutritional needs of the elderly by increasing the quantity and quality of food available to them.

Two coalitions have formed in Nashville to advocate for better and expanded food programs for those in need. Mana Inc. advocates for the expansion and improvement of federal food programs, provides food stamp outreach and nutritional education, and sponsors a Child Care Food Program for family day care providers. The Tennessee Hunger Coalition works to make more food programs available to minorities and others in need and to organize constituents.

Public awareness regarding the problem of hunger in Nashville has been increased through efforts undertaken by the local media to highlight the growing need for food assistance. Press and TV features have focused on service provided by the Metropolitan Social Services' Family, Nutrition, and Housing Assistance programs. Feature stories have been written about proposed cuts in federal programs, the increasing caseload of voluntary relief agencies and the need for more contributions to food banks. Public and private service agencies have also undertaken activities to inform the public regarding emergency food needs and services available to meet those needs. The Metropolitan Action Commission, for example, has initiated several public information efforts including discussions on radio and television talk shows, public service announcements, newspaper articles, and mass mailings to its membership, churches and social service officials. Public awareness activities have also been undertaken by Mana, Inc., the Tennessee Department of Human Services and the Second Harvest Food Bank.

Unmet Needs

Although no specific figures are available, Metropolitan officials surmise that many people in Nashville are undernourished, and in some cases, stealing to eat. Indeed, food stamps and school lunches have saved many adults and children from hunger and malnutrition, and may even have saved some from starvation. Many people have had to move in with relatives or share whatever food is available. Metropolitan Community Action staff cite many instances where energy assistance applicants face a "heat or eat" dilemma.

More children, infants and pregnant women are suffering from insufficient food. As a result, the incidence of health problems related to malnutrition have increased. Despite an exemplary maternity and infant care program in Metropolitan General Hospital,

infant mortality in Nashville-Davidson County has increased from 12.5 per 1,000 births in 1980 to 13.6 in 1981. The incidence of low birth weight has also risen from 8.6 per 1,000 to 8.9 for the first three quarters of 1982. The incidence of iron deficiency anemia and stunted growth is at least twice as high among Metropolitan area low-income children and infants as it is across the country. Nashville officials point out, however, that at a time when there is a greater need for food assistance to deal with these problems, federal programs which provide such assistance have become more restrictive. As a result, many people are not receiving the services they need.

According to Metropolitan Action Commission officials, mechanisms to deal with the current need for food assistance are already in place in Nashville. However, resources such as transportation and staffing, needed to operate the programs are not sufficiently available. Health Department officials would like to see more distribution sites for participants in the Supplemental Food Program. In many instances, participants are unable to pick-up their food because they have no transportation to the site.

NEW ORLEANS

Mayor: Ernest N. Morial
Population: 557,515
Population in Poverty: 18.3%
Minority Population: 59.8%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 9.6%
3/82 -- 8.5%

Problems

Social service agencies in New Orleans have experienced an increase in demand for emergency food during the last 18 months, although the demand has leveled off in the last several months.

- The Mayor's Citizen Action Center recorded a 222 percent increase in calls for food assistance when the first nine months of 1982 are compared with the same period in 1981.
- The Community Food Bank experienced a client increase of more than 67 percent since January, 1982 and expects this trend to continue in 1983.
- Intake in the Salvation Army's food program has increased by 40 percent in the past year.
- Requests for food from St. John the Baptist Inn increased by 17.5 percent during October, 1982.
- The Ozanam Inn registered an 11.8 percent increase in meals served from September, 1981 to September, 1982.

The experience was slightly different in federal programs operating in New Orleans. The Commodities Supplemental Food Program experienced an increase of only 1.7 percent, when the first ten months of 1981 are compared with the same period in 1982. Local officials indicate that this decline does not necessarily reflect a decline in the need for food, but rather is the result of changes in eligibility requirements that were instituted by the federal government in October, 1981.

Local providers identify three main causes for the increase in hunger problems:

- unemployment among local persons;
- unemployment among persons from other locations seeking jobs in New Orleans; and
- cutbacks in federal food programs such as food stamps.

Almost all segments of the population have experienced an increase in

the need for emergency food. Previously, most emergency food recipients tended to be low income families, elderly, disabled, or destitute adult individuals, and members of minority groups (primarily Blacks). Recently, other groups including middle income families, blue collar workers, and young adults are increasingly seeking emergency foods and more of these people are White or Hispanic. The Community Food Bank reports that most of its new clients are families in which the husband recently lost his job, members of the "new poor." The Salvation Army also indicates that the most significant increase it has seen is among clients from two parent families, many of whom are unemployed and have been evicted from their homes.

Responses

Working with private agencies, the City of New Orleans has undertaken two successful city-wide efforts to raise awareness of the need for food programs as well as support for them. Mayor Morial proclaimed Food Week, which included a citywide food drive. Over 8000 City employees donated food to the local Food Bank and the City provided its annual $4000 grant. The Walk For The Hungry was organized jointly by the City and the organization Bread For The World to bring attention to the problem of hunger in the City. It brought over 500 walkers on a rainy day, and with them a lot of publicity to the issue.

At least ten agencies in New Orleans provide emergency food services. Most are private non-profit, religious or charitable organizations. Most obtain the majority of their food through donations from individuals or businesses. Information on three of these agencies follows:

- St. John the Baptist Inn receives its food from the local Food Bank, U.S. Department of Agriculture Commodities, Total Community Action, McKenzies Bakery and churches in the neighborhood. Volunteers help to serve the meals.

- The Ozanam Inn relies solely on private funding. It is owned and operated by the Archdiocese of New Orleans, but also receives funds from Protestant and Jewish organizations and businesses. The Inn does use USDA commodities, but they constitute only a small percentage of the food stuff received.

- The Community Food Distribution Center (Food Bank) receives 73 percent of its food from community based food drives. Other food is purchased with funds received from city and state governments and the United Way, which provides 80 percent of all funding. Volunteers seek donations for the food drives.

Two new emergency food programs are being implemented in New Orleans:

- The Elderly Supplemental Food Program -- The U.S. Department

of Agriculture, State Health Department, City Health Department and the Archdiocese will provide food to 1800 low income elderly persons through this demonstration project, one of three in the nation. Each participant will receive 30 pounds of high protein commodities each month. Although the program has not yet begun operation, it already has a waiting list.

- Second Harvest -- The Archdiocese is establishing a program to distribute surplus or damaged food to non-profit programs. Business or distributors which contribute food will receive tax benefits. Trucks, telephones, staff and warehouse space are being donated to the program. It is anticipated that about 100,000 pounds of food will be handled per month.

Two organizations have undertaken substantial efforts to educate the public about the problems of hunger. The Survival Coalition has held seminars on subjects including the rights and benefits of food stamp recipients, federal budget cuts, and child and infant feeding. The group also advocates for hunger issues, primarily in the Louisiana Legislature. Bread For The World is a national organization with a local chapter in New Orleans. Made up of persons from a cross-section of religious denominations, its main purpose is to educate the public about the problems of hunger. Recently the group has been lobbying the Louisiana Congressional delegation for continued support of the WIC program, and it organized the Walk For The Hungry campaign.

New Orleans City government has worked closely with a number of private service providers. The Citizen Action Center and the Welfare Department refer potential clients to the appropriate agency. VIGOR, New Orleans' volunteer program, provides volunteers to the different agencies. The Office of Public Information has helped to publicize a number of local efforts, including Walk For The Hungry.

Mayor Ernest N. Morial has played an important role as a spokesperson for the issue of hunger, nationally through the Conference of Mayors and in New Orleans. In so doing he has helped to increase the awareness of the problem among the general public. He has given special visibility to the issue in New Orleans through his work with the local agencies providing emergency food services.

The Mayor has made a special effort in response to the high incidence of unhealthy births in New Orleans (20 per 1000, compared to 12 per 1000 nationwide). Despite the excellent health care facilities available in New Orleans, poor nutrition and health among pregnant women, attributed to ignorance and poverty, have led to this problem. To combat it Mayor Morial has officially declared the Year of the Healthy Birth and has encouraged local women to take advantage of the Women, Infant and Children program and to visit local health clinics during pregnancy. The program is entirely supported by private donations.

Unmet Needs

While most local agencies are able to meet the current demand for emergency food services, most feel that the food supply is being stretched to its limit to do this. They do not need additional facilities as much as additional food supplies. The Food Bank has indicated that in order to meet the current demand without difficulty, it needs to maintain a five day supply of food. Currently, it is only able to maintain a three day supply.

OAKLAND
Mayor: Lionel Wilson
Population: 339,337
Population in Poverty: 24%
Minority Population: 71.4%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 12.7%
3/82 -- 12.1%

Problems

The demand for food assistance programs in Oakland has increased substantially recently:

- During 1982 the number of Oakland residents participating in emergency food programs increased by one-third from 15,000 to 20,000 people.
- Since the surplus commodities program began in Oakland in September, 1982, the number of participants has increased rapidly and there are now about 35,000 people taking advantage of it.
- During 1982 the number of food stamp recipients in Oakland increased by 7.5 percent, despite more stringent eligibility guidelines.

City officials attribute the growth in demand to a high rate of unemployment, due primarily to plant closures, lack of economic growth and a large unskilled labor force. The people in need of assistance are unemployed or low income. Eighty percent are Black, 10 percent White, and 10 percent Hispanic. The majority of the participants in the programs are young mothers and their children. City officials estimate that approximately 50,000 low income Oakland residents could use emergency food services. At present less than half of these, or 20,000, can be served.

Responses

Oakland's Mayor Lionel Wilson has established a Task Force on Emergency Shelter and Hunger to coordinate efforts to address the problems of increasing hunger and homelessness. Its membership includes representatives of city and county governments, churches, and community-based organizations. To coordinate food distribution, establishment of congregate meal sites, public information, and other activities, community agencies, churches and voluntary organizations have formed the Alameda County Emergency Food Coalition.

Emergency food facilities are operated primarily with County revenue sharing funds, which constitute 98 percent of the funding, or $279,948. Private, charitable donations account for the other 2 percent. Thirty percent of the program staff are paid employees; 70 percent are volunteers. Food is purchased wholesale through a local

food company and distributed at 13 sites throughout Alameda County, six of them in Oakland. The Alameda County Social Services Agency refers applicants to the emergency food programs. Applicants must be current or prospective welfare recipients. One-hundred percent of the applicants request emergency food assistance; 20 percent request shelter. The several voluntary and religious agencies which provide food services include Bay Area Community Services, the Salvation Army, St. Vincent de Paul, and the Red Cross.

Efforts are now underway in Oakland to locate additional resources or donated food, involve community based non-profit organizations in the USDA surplus commodities program, and develop a plan for a food bank. The City is working to involve churches, community based non-profit organizations and voluntary agencies in dealing with the problem and to coordinate their efforts in order to increase the resources available. To increase public awareness of the problem there have been public service announcements on television, newspaper articles, and the distribution of brochures and fliers. Fund raising has been done by telephone and through speeches made to business organizations and social clubs.

Unmet Needs

Services are clearly not available to meet the current needs in Oakland. Thirty thousand people are in need of emergency food services and cannot now be served. Additional facilities and food are needed; existing facilities need to be expanded.

ROCHESTER

Mayor: Thomas Ryan
Population: 241,741
Population in Poverty: 17.5%
Minority Population: 32.2%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 14%
3/82 -- 9.8%

Problems

As in other cities across the country the demand for emergency food assistance in Rochester has grown in the last year. The number of soup kitchens has almost doubled in the last nine months, going from four to seven. All of the soup kitchens claim to be serving more people than they did previously. The local United Way has recognized support of basic needs as a priority and allocated $300,000 for this area.

City officials attribute the increased demand for food assistance to several different factors including:

- cutbacks in food stamps and child nutrition programs;
- time lag in receiving cash assistance, such as unemployment benefits or welfare. This time lag has increased because of reduced local, state and federal budgets which seem to make agencies move even slower;
- more people receiving public assistance;
- a growing number of young people who come to Rochester in search of a job and are unable to find it;
- a lack of affordable housing and excessive energy costs; and
- an increase of over 42 percent in the City's unemployment rate from 9.8 percent in March, 1982 to 14 percent in April, 1983.

City officials estimate that 17 percent of the population, or 41,096 people, in Rochester need food assistance. They are careful to point out, however, that that does not mean that 41,096 people in Rochester are hungry.

Responses

The response to the need for food assistance in Rochester has centered in the private sector, primarily with church and neighborhood organizations. The Salvation Army and local settlement houses receive funds from United Way to provide some emergency services to people in

need of assistance. While the settlement houses do get involved in the distribution of surplus commodities, food cupboards and soup kitchens have become the major providers of emergency food. Efforts are coordinated by two local coalitions, the Rochester Area Food Coalition, which is comprised of emergency food cupboards in various neighborhoods, and Food for People, which coordinates and advocates for emergency food distribution. The Rochester Area Coalition includes among its members Action for a Better Community (the local CAA), the Salvation Army, 14 food cupboards, and representatives of the various denominations of Genesee Ecumenical Ministries. Through the cupboards over 9,000 persons receive food per year.

Churches form the backbone of the emergency food system in Rochester. Most facilities are operated with church dollars, supplemented by food banks and grants from private foundations. Food is obtained from gleaning or from food distributors. Volunteers do almost all of the work.

The Genesee Valley Regional Food Bank distributes about 100,000 pounds of food every month through 132 different agencies in a ten county area. The food bank does not serve individuals, but rather agencies that are public charities serving the ill, the needy, or children. From April, 1981 to March, 1982 the amount of food handled by the food bank doubled and it has increased by as much again in the last year.

Although Monroe County and not the City of Rochester has primary responsibility for the provision of human services, including emergency services, in the area, the City has been involved in efforts to deal with the problem of hunger through a number of programs. They include:

- grants from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to provide seed money to nutrition centers in the city;
- a senior citizens nutrition program at one of the recreation centers, which offers a year-round hot lunch program for seniors, using funds from the Administration on Aging;
- a summer youth lunch program operated at various sites throughout the City with funds from the Department of Interior.

While surplus commodities have been used in Rochester, City officials do express concern regarding them. To make the trip to Holley, New York, where they are available, worthwhile, large quantities must be brought back. Most agencies do not have the trucks, personnel, storage, and refrigeration facilities needed, however. Most emergency food providers feel that the distribution of these commodities is not an efficient use of resources and that it would be better to abolish the program and restore funds for the food stamp program.

Unmet Needs

So far the emergency food services available in Rochester have been able to keep up with the demand. Additional feeding facilities are needed, however, so that families with children would not be mixed in with transients and others who choose homelessness as a lifestyle. Officials feel that a community meals program in which families could eat together would be an improvement over the current situation. Also, the Genessee Valley Regional Food Bank needs better warehouse facilities.

SAN ANTONIO

Mayor: Henry Cisneros
Population: 988,800
Population in Poverty: 18.5%
Minority Population: 56.1%
Official Unemployment Rate: 3/83 -- 7.2%
3/82 -- 5.8%

Problems

Despite tremendous efforts undertaken to deal with the problem of hunger in the City, many people in San Antonio go to bed hungry every night, according to the San Antonio Express News. The number of individuals and families in need of emergency food assistance has increased dramatically in the past two years. For example, during the City's last fiscal year which ended in September, 1982, 10,000 families received food assistance from the Community Action Division of the City's Department of Human Resources and Services. That figure was equaled during the remaining three months of the year alone, and the Division's administrator anticipates that as many as 50,000 families will request assistance this year. Today, there are 105 private agencies providing emergency food services in San Antonio, more than double the number there were two years ago. Last year, these agencies were providing meals or food boxes to approximately 42,000 people daily; in 1983, these same agencies are serving about 63,000 people each day.

The people asking for help are transients from other areas of the country who have moved to the Sunbelt seeking employment and are now in need of food and shelter. They are elderly persons living on fixed incomes who need food supplements in order to make ends meet. They are people who are no longer eligible for federal and state assistance because of recent tightening of eligibility criteria. They are workers whose low-wages and high living costs are placing serious burdens on the family budget; they are unemployed workers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits.

It is estimated that less than a quarter of the unemployed people in the San Antonio area are receiving unemployment compensation. Between September and November, 1982, for example, 5,375 people in the area received their last unemployment check. And, while its unemployment rate (7.2 percent) is relatively low, San Antonio has another chronic problem, that of a per capita income level which is significantly lower than that for the whole state of Texas or the nation. A recent city study shows that 224,000 persons, or 29 percent of the official 1981 City population of 785,410, are still living below the poverty line. Eleven percent of the households in San Antonio derive their income from Social Security or Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

By all indications, the number of people in need of emergency food services in San Antonio is expected to continue to increase substantially in the near future. City officials there anticipate approximately 200,000 people will request assistance this year.

Responses

In 1979, a major step was taken in San Antonio to address the problem of hunger on a large scale with the creation of the San Antonio Food Bank. The Bank was established as a private non-profit corporation designed to serve as a central clearinghouse for donated food. The corporation was organized by a coalition of churches and individuals. An advisory board to the City Council, the Community Action Board, was instrumental in its establishment.

Initially, the operation of the Bank was supported mostly by private donations which were supplemented by a small grant from the Community Food and Nutrition Program of the Community Services Administration. In January, 1983, however, the San Antonio Food Bank experienced a funding crisis and requested a $30,000 grant from the City of San Antonio. At the urging of Mayor Henry Cisneros and former Mayor Lila Cockrell, the City Council, using funds from the Community Services Block Grant program, awarded a grant which enabled the Food Bank to continue operating. In the two years of its existence, the San Antonio Food Bank has distributed more than $2 million worth of food to the 105 agencies, churches, and organizations operating food pantries throughout the City.

In order to meet the increasing demand for its services, the San Antonio Food Bank recently requested funding of $50,000 from the City for the expansion of its operations. This expansion would include a larger warehouse which would enable the receipt and storage of a significantly greater amount of food. The new warehouse would have 27,000 square feet in contrast to the 8,000 square feet available in the present facility. A portion of the requested funds would also be used to pay for the transportation of donated food. In the past, donated food had to be refused at times because of inadequate storage facilities or because funds were not available to pay for transporting the food to the organizations that distribute it to the public. An ordinance is presently being prepared for City Council review on this matter and favorable consideration is anticipated. If the proposed funding is approved, the San Antonio Food Bank, which will be the largest in the Southwest and one of the largest in the country, will be able to distribute over three metric tons of food annually to needy persons.

The Food Bank has a small core of staff whose salaries are paid through funds made available by the City contract. VISTA workers and volunteers from the community are also used.

In addition to the San Antonio Food Bank and the 105 organizations that provide emergency food services, there are a number of other agencies in the City that are trying to meet the increasing

demand for food assistance. They include 30 neighborhood centers operated by the City's Community Action Division which provide emergency food assistance on a routine basis; Project F.R.E.E., the largest meals-on-wheels program in the country, which is a delegate agency of the Department of Human Resources and Services; and, 33 congregate nutrition sites for senior citizens operated by the City's Metropolitan Office on Aging. The Urban Coalition of Churches also maintains a number of food pantries. And, the Salvation Army and the Christian Assistance Ministry, a coalition of eleven churches, provide emergency food and shelter, primarily to transients.

Another initiative undertaken in San Antonio to deal with the problem of hunger was the establishment in 1980 of the Texas Anti-Hunger Coalition, a state-wide organization comprised predominantly of community agencies. The headquarters for this organization is now located in Austin. The Coalition was instrumental in obtaining passage of the "Good Faith Donor," a state law that facilitates the donation of larger quantities of food by Texas merchants by relieving the donor of liability for food donation. This legislation also relieved food banks from liability in their donation of food to the needy. The Coalition has established a state-wide network of food banks which, in turn, has established linkages with the national Second Harvest network of food banks.

As the primary leader in his City, Mayor Henry Cisneros has played an active role in mobilizing resources needed to address the problem of hunger in San Antonio. He has been very supportive of the San Antonio Food Bank, urging the City Council earlier this year to allocate funds needed for the continuation of the operations of the Bank and asking monetary support and food donations for the Bank from the private sector. He has appealed to the public for their contribution to efforts to assist their needy neighbors.

Public awareness of the problem has also been raised by the local media. In January, 1983, the major local newspaper printed an extensive front-page article on hunger in San Antonio. Subsequently, there have been numerous other articles written on the subject. Local radio and television stations routinely air public service announcements about social service agencies providing food. There are also widespread announcements on commodities distributions, which are carried out through the Food Bank.

Unmet Needs

Although the City, private agencies, and the general public have made significant strides in their efforts to alleviate the problem of hunger in San Antonio, the demand for emergency food continues to grow and the need for additional resources is evident. Currently, all emergency cases of people who have completely run out of food are being served. However, much more food is required in order to serve all persons who need additional food to supplement their diet. Even when donations to the Food Bank are plentiful, the Bank cannot be expected to supply all the food necessary for a nutritious diet. Empty shelves are becoming a more frequent sight at local food pantries. It is estimated that as many as 100,000 persons need additional food on a regular basis in San Antonio. At present, there is only enough food to meet half of this need.

CONCLUSION

This publication has shown that all of the cities studied have experienced recent and significant increases in the demand for emergency food assistance and that all have undertaken substantial local efforts to respond to these increases. Only three of the cities, however, are able to meet the increased demand, two of them just barely.

The Conference of Mayors, with support from the American Can Company Foundation, will develop a second publication which will provide additional information on exemplary efforts in cities to respond to the increased demand for emergency food assistance. It will include specific examples intended to assist city governments and the private sector in identifying and initiating local projects.

In the last year, local communities have pulled together, possibly in ways not seen in the last half century, since the tragedy of the Great Depression. Extraordinary efforts have been made by government, religious and voluntary agencies to respond to the need for emergency assistance. But, the need is outstripping the public and private resources that are available.

It has long been the position of the Conference of Mayors that for those unable to work or unable to find work, the federal government should assure that the basic necessities of life -- food, shelter, and medical care -- are met. Along with this, the Conference has also asserted that the federal government has a responsibility to ensure that every American has the same opportunity to work, and through productive work to be self-sufficient.

The Emergency Jobs Bill is helping to meet some of these needs, but further action must be taken. Through sufficient funding levels for income security programs, food stamps and other nutrition assistance programs, through the provision of more surplus commodities, with assistance to state and local governments and agencies to cover distribution and storage costs, and through job creation programs, significant progress can be made.

Chairman PERKINS. We will hear from you now, Ms. Gravenmier. We are glad to have you with us today. Go right ahead.

[The prepared statement of Faith Gravenmier follows:]

THE PREPARED STATEMENT OF FAITH GRAVENMIER, THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Goodling, members of the committee, my name is Faith Gravenmier. I am the Director of Child Nutrition for the State of West Virginia and Chairman of the State Directors Section of the American School Food Service Association. We are very pleased to respond to your invitation to testify on the restoration of funds to child nutrition program. Our testimony today will compliment and supplement our testimony of June 2, 1983.

The 1984 budget resolution as agreed to by the Congress assumes and makes room for an increase of $150 million in funding for child nutrition. This figure represents but a 10 percent restoration of the $1.5 billion in child nutrition budget cuts enacted during the 97th Congress. Based on the decline in student participation in the school lunch program, the high unemployment rate throughout the country, and the growing evidence of nutritional need reported to this Committee, and the Agriculture Committee during its recent set of hearings, we urge you to favorably report legislation increasing the funding for child nutrition by $150 million.

There are, Mr. Chairman, a number of options for inclusion in such a bill:

(1) Set the reduced price lunch reimbursement rate at 25 cents less than the free lunch rate and the reduced price breakfast rate at 15 cents less than the free breakfast rate. The decline in student participation in this category has been drastic and we would therefore make this provision a priority.

(2) Increase the federal subsidy in the breakfast program by 10 cents per breakfast, three times a week, in order to enhance the protein component of the school breakfast meal pattern. The recently published USDA National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs found that the school breakfast program was deficient in this regard.

(3) Restore one meal and one snack to the child care food program.

(4) Increase the funding for Nutrition Education and Training. We would suggest perhaps a rate of 20 cents per child per year. The N.E.T. program was originally funded at the rate of 50 cents per year but has been cut back to an appropriation of only $5 million this year.

These four changes would cost approximately $120 million. With the remaining funds there are a number of possibilities, all of which, in our opinion, are important:

(A) Increase the reduced priced lunch eligibility guideline from 185 percent of poverty to 195 percent of poverty.

(B) Eliminate the tuition limitation for private schools participating in the National School Lunch Program.

(C) Provide an administrative expense formula for the storage and distribution of USDA "entitlement" commodities at an amount equal to 5 percent of the value of the commodities donated.

(D) Establish a special medical hardship deduction in the school lunch program.

We would also urge the Committee to separate the free lunch eligibility guideline from the foodstamp eligibility guideline. It could be kept at 130 percent of the poverty line so as not to incur a cost, but in so doing we would not have to worry that if the foodstamp guideline was changed in the future it would effect the free lunch program.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that we have not recommended an increase in Section 4 funding at this time. While the cut in that Section was particularly deep, given the limitation of $150 million we did not feel it appropriate to suggest an increase in Section 4 funding in this bill.

We believe that the suggestions we are making here this morning represent a fair and well rounded $150 million child nutrition package. We have attempted to take into consideration the nutritional needs of all children as well as the budgetary constraints. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

STATEMENT OF FAITH GRAVENMIER, DIRECTOR OF CHILD NUTRITION, STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY JIM MILLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION INDUSTRY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Ms. GRAVENMIER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Faith Gravenmier. I am the director of Child Nutrition for the State of West Virginia and also serve this year as chairman of the State Directors Section of the American School Food Service Association.

We are very pleased to respond to your invitation to us to testify today on the restoration of funds to the child nutrition programs. I am pleased to introduce to the panel also Mr. Jim Miller, who is with us. He is chairman of the ASFSA Industry Advisory Council.

Our testimony today will complement and supplement our testimony of June 2, 1983. The 1984 budget resolution, as agreed to by the Congress, assumes and makes room for an increase of $150 million in funding for child nutrition. This figure, of course, represents a 10-percent restoration of the $1.5 billion in child nutrition budget cuts that were enacted by the 97th Congress.

Based on the decline in student participation in school lunch program and the high unemployment rate—and I am sorry to say that our State continues to lead the Nation in this respect—and also the growing evidence of nutritional need, as reported today to the committee and during the Agricultural Committee's recent set of hearings, we urge all of you to favorably report legislation which increases the funding for child nutrition by $150 million.

There are, Mr. Chairman, as you know, a number of options which could be included in such a bill. One option would be to set the reduced-price lunch reimbursement rate at 25 cents less than the paid rate, and the reduced-price breakfast rate 15 cents less than the free breakfast rate. The decline in student participation in this category has been drastic and we would, therefore, make this provision a high priority item.

As you know, a recent survey of child nutrition——

Chairman PERKINS. I would agree with you that the reduced-price reimbursement rate should be changed.

Ms. GRAVENMIER. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Ms. GRAVENMIER. A recent survey of child nutrition programs in some of our major cities, as referred to today, too, show a pronounced drop in the reduced-price lunch participation when the prices were increased. As you know, we have come from a 10-cent reimbursement rate in 1980 to a 40-cent rate for a reduced-price lunch in 1983.

Chairman PERKINS. That has shut an awful lot of children out of the program.

Ms. GRAVENMIER. It surely has.

Well, cities have reported anywhere from a 20-, 25-, or a 48-percent loss of participation in this category and our statewide figures of October 1982 in West Virginia were at the 20-percent level, which is pretty high statewide, I think.

Another option, of course, will be to increase the Federal subsidy in the breakfast program by 10 cents a breakfast three times a week, and that will be in order to enhance the protein component of the school breakfast program.

The recently published USDA "National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs" found that the school breakfast program was deficient in this regard. Just yesterday, I had a parent talking to me on the phone about the need of his child for free or reduced-price meals. He mentioned the fact that he felt it an unwise expenditure to spend 30 cents for a reduced-price breakfast and the child to be only served juice, toast, and milk or sometimes juice, donut, and milk.

Another option would be to restore one meal and one snack to the child care food program. It is not unusual, I understand, in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky, particularly the Louisville, Ky., area, for very young children—sometimes 3 or under—to arrive at a center or a family day care home at 7:30 a.m. and to be picked up by their parents at 6 p.m. You can see the need for meals plus supplemental nourishment for a child that is away from home this long during a regular working day.

Chairman PERKINS. That is certainly true throughout the whole Appalachian area because of the road conditions and the consolidation of schools. It's very hard on the children.

Ms. GRAVENMIER. We hope that it will be possible to increase the funding for nutrition, education and training. Of course, West Virginia began a nutrition, education and training with one of the first Federal grants in 1971. The NET program, as you know, was originally funded at the rate of 50 cents per child per year and has been cut back gradually to an appropriation of only $5 million this year. Many of our States are in the same situation as ours; they have dropped from a 50-cent-per-child-per-year eligibility or entitlement to a minimum-level grant of some $50,000 a year. It is very difficult to plan and coordinate an ongoing nutrition education program in the classroom, to train the new teachers coming on and also to provide some training for our school food service personnel when funding is fluctuating so from year to year.

These four changes I mentioned would cost approximately $120 million. With the remaining funds, there are a number of possibilities, all of which, in our opinion, are important.

We might increase the reduced-price lunch eligibility guideline from 185 percent of the poverty to 195 percent of the poverty level. We might eliminate the tuition limitation for private schools under the school lunch program.

Another important exciting option would be to provide an administrative expense formula for the storage and distribution of USDA entitlement commodities at an amount equal to 5 percent of the value of the commodities donated.

A very unofficial survey we did of State directors in March of 1983 indicated to us that 50 percent of our States are necessarily charging the local schools for delivery and storage of commodities, that is, from the warehouse within the State to the school or county level. West Virginia is one of those States which does have a charge to the individual schools, including the private and residential institutions.

Another important option might be to establish a special medical hardship deduction in the school lunch program. In another one of my telephone conversations of yesterday, of which there were many, I was talking to a gentleman who has one child in school and he is disabled. I never could make him understand why his child was eligible for a free lunch in 1980 and now is possibly eligible for a reduced-price lunch and breakfast in 1983.

We would also urge the committee to separate the free lunch eligibility guideline from the food stamp eligibility guideline. It could be kept at the same level of 130 percent of the poverty level so as not to incur an additional cost, but in so doing, we would not have to worry in the future that as the food stamp guidelines should inadvertently be changed, that it would also effect the lunch program, the breakfast and the child care food program and the summer program.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that we have not recommended an increase in section 4 funding at this time. While the cut in section 4 was particularly deep, given the limitation of $150 million, we didn't feel it appropriate to suggest an increase in section 4 funding in this particular bill.

We believe the suggestions that we are making here this morning represent a fair, well-rounded $150 million child nutrition package. We have tried to take into consideration the nutritional needs of all of our children as well as the budgetary constraints.

We would be happy to answer any questions that you may have. I would like to say at this point that we appreciate the efforts that you, Mr. Perkins, and that Mr. Goodling have shown in developing bipartisan support for the children of America. We feel that the bipartisan nature of this support has been very important. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank you for that statement. We will hear now from Ms. Parker with the Food Research and Action Center.

Go right ahead, Ms. Parker.

STATEMENT OF LYNN PARKER, STAFF NUTRITIONIST, FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER [FRAC]

Ms. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Hawkins, and Mr. Gunderson, for allowing me to speak to you today about the child nutrition programs. I really appreciate this opportunity to talk to you. I have a long written statement which I would like included in the record, but I think I will summarize my statement to you today.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Without objection, your entire statement will be made a part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Lynn Parker follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LYNN PARKER, FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify before this distinguished Committee. We recognize and appreciate your strong leadership on behalf of Children and the general bipartisan support which these programs have enjoyed in Congress.

The Food Research and Action Center is a public interest law firm and nutrition program advocacy center. My role at FRAC includes the analysis of nutrition-relat-

ed aspects of the federal food and nutrition education programs, their impact on low income families, and legislation, regulations, and policy issues which affect federal food programs and their recipients.

I have a Master of Science degree in Human Nutrition from Cornell University. I served as the 1981 Chairperson of the Food and Nutrition Section's Resolutions and Legislative Committees of the American Public Health Association. Recently, I was elected Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Society for Nutrition Education, an active membership organization of 5,000 professional nutritionists.

I have attached to my testimony a list of legislative recommendations which enjoy wide support in the child nutrition community for your consideration. These recommendations address vital program restorations in the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs, the Nutrition Education and Training Program (NET) and the Child Care Food Program (CCFP). Today, however, I would like to focus your attention on two specific program restorations in the School Breakfast and Child Care Food Programs. These provisions concern the improvement of the School Breakfast meal pattern and the restoration of one meal and one supplement to the Child Care Food Program. I feel that I am in a unique position to comment on these provisions since I was a member of the Advisory group to the USDA National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs, USDA's National Meal Pattern Monitoring Committee (December 1980), and USDA's Meal Pattern Task Force (July 1981). As you can see, my participation in USDA policy formation on school lunch and breakfast meal patterns began in the Carter Administration and continued through the Reagan Administration.

SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

We understand that one of the provisions the Committee is considering is the addition of 38 million dollars for the purpose of providing a meat-meat alternate component in 60 percent of the breakfasts served each week and improving the nutritional quality of the school breakfast meal pattern. This could be accomplished by adding 10 cents to breakfast reimbursements for 3 meals per week.

We heartily endorse this provision for a number of reasons:

(1) A recent nationwide study shows that the nutritional quality of school breakfasts can be improved. Let me give you a little background. In 1979 the Senate passed a resolution, commonly referred to as Senate Resolution 90, which asked a number of questions about the impact of school meals on children and their families. A number of studies were initiated in response to this resolution, but one of them specifically looked at the nutritional impacts of the School Lunch, Breakfast, and Special Milk Programs. It is called the National Evaluation of School Nutrition Programs, was completed in April 1983, and was the evaluation for which I served as advisory group member, as I mentioned earlier.

This study reported two major findings concerning the School Breakfast Program. First, the program was shown to increase the likelihood that children will eat breakfast. As the study points out, this is a major nutritional benefit in that children who eat a breakfast are substantially better nourished than those who skip breakfast. Projections made from this study's data show that over 600,000 students who currently skip breakfast would eat it if the program were available in their schools.

Second, the school breakfast is superior in calcium and magnesium levels to breakfasts children eat elsewhere, but contains less vitamin B6, vitamin A and iron. (Interestingly enough, however, over a 24-hour period the intake of these nutrients is similar for school breakfast participants and those who eat breakfast elsewhere. Their intake is made up during the remainder of the day.) Since vitamin A, vitamin B6 and iron are nutrients for which large proportions of children do not obtain their Recommended Dietary Allowances (as pointed out in USDA's National Evaluation), it makes sense to improve the nutritional quality of the Breakfast Program in such a way that: The consumption of these nutrients is increased; and the breakfast eaten at school is closer in nutritional quality to breakfasts eaten at home.

In fact, the National Evaluation final report recommends that "the School Breakfast meal pattern should be examined and improved." It was surprising to all of us when USDA's response to this recommendation was to suggest terminating School Breakfast as a categorial program and placing it in a block grant with reduced funds. Obviously this legislative recommendation conflicts with the findings of the report.

The National Evaluation results do not tell us which foods made the nutritional difference between the school breakfasts and those eaten elsewhere. However, it is likely that it was the meat/meat alternate. First, because the School Breakfast meal

pattern does not require the service of a meat/meat alternate. It does require a cereal or bread product; juice, fruit, or vegetable; and one half pint of milk. Second, because cheese and eggs are good sources of vitamin A, and meat, poultry, fish, and peanut butter are good sources of iron and vitamin B6. The addition of these meat-meat alternates three times a week would improve the nutritional quality of school breakfasts.

(2) Participation in the Breakfast Program by students and schools will probably increase with this provision because it will increase the variety and appeal of the Breakfast Program and will increase reimbursements to schools. This increase in participation by students and schools is very important, especially considering two of the National Evaluation's findings: that the presence of a School Breakfast Program increases the chances that children will eat breakfast, and that the Program is found predominantly in schools located in low income areas and serves primarily poor children. In fact, 84 percent of the children who participate in the Breakfast Program are from families eligible for free meals, and 89 percent from families eligible for free or reduced price meals.

(3) Breakfast is a very important meal for children, as you all know well as parents and as legislators on the Education and Labor Committee. We have two kinds of evidence to show that this is the case. First are the studies of the impact of breakfast, or the lack of it, on children's learning ability. Dr. Ernesto Pollitt in a 1978 review of the literature on the impact of school feeding programs on education sums up the evidence on breakfast as follows:

"The studies that focused on the short-term effects of hunger or morning feeding suggest that the provision of breakfast may both benefit the student emotionally and enhance his/her capacity to work on school-type tasks."

A recent carefully controlled study by Dr. Pollitt (1981) of the impact of skipping breakfast on thirty-four well-nourished nine and 10 year olds showed an adverse effect on the accuracy of responses on problem solving.

The second kind of evidence is what we call anecdotal, and that is the reports of superintendents, principals, school nurses, and teachers. They tell us again and again, each time a new breakfast program starts, how children's reading scores increase, how relationships between students of different ages improve in the morning, how students have less stomachaches, and how much better children pay attention in class. Just last week I was in West Virginia and was told by a long-time school principal that starting a Breakfast Program in her school had more positive effects than any other one thing she had accomplished. We should remember, as I was reminded during my West Virginia trip, that there are many children to whom the breakfast provided at school is essential, and that this is true now more than ever with continuing high unemployment.

CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

Another program upon which many low income families depend is the Child Care Food Program (CCFP) for preschool children in family day care homes and day care centers. Unfortunately children who stay at a day care center all day only may receive two meals and one snack because of cuts made in federal support for the Child Care Food Program. We understand that one of the provisions you are considering would add a meal and a snack back to the Child Care Food Program, and we urge you to adopt it. Let me tell you why.

First, the nutritional evidence. Before the changes occurred in the number of meals that could be served, USDA carried out an evaluation of the nutritional impact of CCFP through Abt Associates in Massachusetts, which showed highly positive effects. In fact, their report stated:

"The differences between participating and nonparticipating day care centers [in meal quality] are striking. For every measure examined, participating centers have statistically significantly higher levels of meal quality than nonparticipating centers. Equally striking is the finding that participating family day care homes also serve meals of superior nutritional quality, and that these meals generally contain foods of higher quality and variety than those served by nonparticipating centers."

To be more specific, day care facilities that participated in CCFP provided a higher proportion of the Recommended Dietary Allowances than nonparticipating centers, had superior food preparation, handling, and sanitation techniques, served significantly more foods rich in vitamin A and C and iron, served fruits, vegetables, and juices 129 percent more often, whole grain products 50 percent more often, and milk more frequently at snacks and lunches. They also served significantly fewer concentrated sweets and sweet dessert foods and had care-givers who talked more often to children about nutrition and encouraged children to try new foods.

The results of this report are corroborated and elaborated upon by a survey of CCFP sponsors in the Northeast region carried out by the Connecticut Department of Education, which has been referred to in previous testimony before this committee by the Children's Defense Fund. The survey found that the quality and quantities of foods served in day care homes improved with their participation in CCFP, because of the funding for food and because of an increase in the availability of good nutrition information that comes with the program. As the New England state directors point out in their survey report, "This knowledge becomes twice as important when you realize that the information is often passed on to the parents of the children because of the close relationship and contact that is possible in family day care."

They also point out another benefit of CCFP in their report:

"The availability of CCFP funds has enabled many providers to remain in operation and to keep their fees at an affordable level. The accessibility of affordable day care has freed many families from low income status."

This is not surprising when one considers the make-up of the parents using the day care homes participating in CCFP in the Northeast region—69 percent held blue-collar or unskilled jobs and 40 percent represented one-parent families.

The impact of the cuts in the number of meals from three to two and number of snacks from two to one have been quite negative, as evidenced by reports coming in from around the country.

In January 1983 the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation surveyed 64 child care sponsors (representing over 9,354 children) in ten San Francisco Bay Area counties in order to measure the longer-term impact of fiscal year 1982 budget cuts. In their June 1983 report Cutting Costs in the Child Nutrition Programs: The Longer-Range Impact of Federal Budget Cuts and How Programs are Coping, the foundation stated that forty-one percent of the surveyed day care programs have been forced to substantially reduce the number of meals served to the children they care for. Another 38 percent have turned to deficit spending rather than cutting back on the meals they serve. This means borrowing from educational materials funds, staff salary funds, etc., to make ends meet; resulting in less service available to the children overall and an overworked staff. Finally, thirty-four percent have significantly cut back on the variety and quality of foods served.

The Hunger Watch U.S.A. report released by Bread for the World this month reports the local effects of budget cuts in federal food assistance programs as catalogued by their members in different parts of the country. They report fewer meals being served to children, because of decreased federal support, in Wake County, North Carolina; Jamestown, North Dakota; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Topeka, Kansas; LaCrosse, Wisconsin; Charlottesville, Virginia; Springfield, Vermont; and Nashville, Tennessee.

Last January, the Children's Defense Fund in collaboration with the Association of Junior Leagues launched Child Watch in over 100 communities nationwide to monitor the impact of federal budget cuts on needy children and families. In Massachusetts, the Child Watch group found that programs across the state had to curtail the amount and variety of food served. The Minnesota group reported that the quality and expertise of cooks and staff had to be reduced, worn-out equipment could not be replaced, and deficits were faced. In Maryland many centers reported a decrease in the variety of meals served and the number of meals and snacks provided.

These changes are occurring at the same time that parents are depending more and more on day care facilities to help them stay on the job and ensure nutritious meals for their children in spite of smaller home food budgets. These cuts are also occurring at the same time as other cuts have made day care programs harder to maintain—reductions in Title XX, CETA, and compensated Child Care costs in AFDC. All three of these programs have provided a great deal of support for child care for low income working families in the past. The Children's Defense Fund has just released a report titled Children and Federal Child Care Cuts, which surveys the impact of federal Title XX cuts on state child care systems. They found that reductions in Title XX funding have triggered cuts in state child care systems throughout the country, including such practices as making fewer low-income working families eligible for Title XX Child Care, increasing fees for child care, reducing funds for training child care workers, lowering child care standards, and cutting back on staff. Obviously the states would be hard put to make up for meals lost when they cannot even pay for staff. Finally, these cuts are happening in the face of an ever-increasing need for child care. Almost 46 percent of mothers with children under three are in the labor force, and almost 57 percent of mothers with children ages three to five are working.

It should be remembered that many of these mothers work long hours, and two meals and a snack are not enough food for their children during their working day. As anyone who has lived with preschoolers knows, they eat a number of small meals during the day. In fact, nutritionists and health professionals recommend small frequent feedings for this age group in order to ensure that their nutritional needs are met. Because of their short attention span, increased exploratory activity, high level of physical activity, and susceptibility to illnesses, small, frequent feedings are essential for preschoolers. For all these reasons, it would be a reasonable and wise social and health policy to reinstate the provision to these children of the amount of food they require over a long day in child care—three meals and two snacks—as they were provided previous to fiscal year 1982.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND NUTRITION EDUCATION

We also support additional funding for the National School Lunch and NET Programs. In the fall of 1982, FRAC issued a report titled The Impact of Child Nutrition Budget Cuts: A Look At the States and Selected School Districts. We asked state and local school food officials what the principal reason was for children dropping out of the school meals programs. A significant number of officials indicated that legislative changes lowering eligibility and raising prices for lunches and breakfasts were leading factors in fewer children being able to practicipate in school nutrition programs. Therefore we urge the committee to raise the eligibility for reduced-price lunch from 185 percent to 195 percent and lower the student charge for school lunch from 40 cents to 25 cents and the charge for school breakfast from 30 cents to 15 cents.

As a nutritionist, I have a particular concern about adequate funding for the Nutrition Education and Training Program. U.S. Department of Agriculture witnesses in the past have suggested that the sole goal of the NET program was the development of classroom curricula on nutrition and that since this goal has been accomplished, the program should be terminated. The Department generally fails to mention that the goals of the program established by law also include: (1) teaching children about nutrition and its relation to health; (2) training food service personnel in the principles and practices of food service management; and (3) instructing teachers in sound principles of nutrition education. Thus, as Katherine L. Clancy, Past President of the Society for Nutrition Education said in testimony before the Subcommittee on Nutrition of the Senate Agriculture Committee (Februry 1982): "The NET Program not only teaches the concepts of food as it relates to nutrition, but actually puts these concepts into practice in the lunchroom."

Also, it should be noted that evaluations of the NET program by USDA have found that the programs in Georgia and Nebraska demonstrated quite positive program effects on student nutrition knowledge (USDA, May, 1982). Our recommendation is to add $3 million to the current $5 million authorization level of NET so that $8 million can be made available to states.

WIC

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude for your efforts to raise the authorization level for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) from $1.126 billion to $1.36 billion. As you know, 500,000 low-income pregnant women, infants and children who have been determined to be at nutritional risk would have to be dropped from the program in fiscal year 1984 if the authorization ceiling remains as is and only $1.126 billion is appropriated for WIC in fiscal year 1984. Please keep up the good work.

OTHER FUNDS SHOULD BE RESTORED

Mr. Chairman, this panel has recommended program restorations in School Lunch and Breakfast, CCFP and NET. These recommendations enjoy wide support in the child nutrition community, but since $150 million represents only 10 percent of the funds cut from the programs in fiscal year 1982, it is not possible to meet all program needs.

We recommend these program changes as the best combination and use of funds to improve the nutritional status of low income children given limited dollars. However, other priority items, were funds available, include restoration of: Free meal eligibility for school meals; allowing private nonprofit sponsors to operate the Summer Food Program; tiering in CCFP; and funds for the Special Milk Program and school lunch reimbursements.

Thank you once again for the opportunity of addressing the committee on these important matters.

Child nutrition program restorations

[$150,000,000 package]	*Millions*
Set reduced-price reimbursement rates at 25 cents less than free for lunch and 15 cents less than free for breakfast (+15 and +15 cents) [1]	$64
Set reduced-price eligibility at 195 percent of poverty	20
Add $38,000,000 to improve the school breakfast program meal pattern [2]	38
Private school eligibility restored for school meals	4
Restore 1 meal and 1 snack to CCFP	15
Increase authorization for nutrition education and training and make it a capped entitlement at $8,000,000	3
Special medical hardship deduction	5
Separate free lunch eligibility from food stamp eligibility	0
Total	149

[1] This provision would require USDA to increase reimbursement for school lunch and breakfast by 15 cents each. Children would pay 25 cents for a reduced-price lunch (rather than the current 40 cents) and 15 cents for a reduced-price breakfast (rather than the current 30 cents).

[2] Allow schools to improve the nutritional quality of breakfast through the provision of meat-meat alternates by providing them with an extra 10 cents per breakfast 3 times a week.

Ms. PARKER. Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Go right ahead.

Ms. PARKER. First, I wanted to say that we recognize at FRAC and appreciate the strong leadership that you have taken to support the child nutrition programs and the bipartisan support that the programs have received from Congress.

Before I start my statement I would just like to tell you a little bit about FRAC or the Food Research and Action Center, and about myself.

The Food Research and Action Center is a public interest law firm and nutrition program advocacy center and my role at FRAC involves analyzing nutrition-related aspects of child nutrition legislation and their impact on low-income children. I have a Masters Degree in Human Nutrition from Cornell University and I have been active in the American Public Health Association and recently was elected to the board of the Society for Nutrition Education, which represents 5,000 professional nutritionists around the country.

I have attached to my testimony a list of legislative recommendations that enjoy wide support in the child nutrition community and we hope that you will consider that list of recommendations. They address vital program restorations in a number of child nutrition programs, but today I would like to focus my comments on restorations in the school breakfast program and the child care food program.

I think I am sort of in a unique position to do this because I was on the advisory group committee that advised the Department of Agriculture on their national evaluation of school nutrition programs that was just reported to Congress in April and also I have been on two other advisory committees on meal patterns, both in the Carter administration and in the Reagan administration to the Department of Agriculture. So I am sort of unique in playing that role in both administrations looking at meal patterns.

Now, to the issues. The first thing that I wanted to talk about was the school breakfast program. We understand that one of the provisions that the committee is considering is the addition of $38

million for the purpose of providing a meat or meat alternate component in the school breakfast program three times a week. We think this could be accomplished, and apparently, the committee is considering adding 10 cents per breakfast for those three meals.

We heartedly endorse this provision and I wanted to give you the reasons why we do. The first is nutritional. The advisory group committee I worked on to the national evaluation of school nutrition programs came out with a nationwide study that showed that the nutritional quality of the breakfast programs could be improved, and it reported two major findings about breakfasts. One was that having a breakfast program in your community increased the chances that the children would eat breakfast. That may sound almost obvious, but what the study showed was that 600,000 more children would be eating breakfast every morning rather than skipping it, if they had a school breakfast program. And that certainly is a nutritional benefit, just having that breakfast, as the evaluation from the Department of Agriculture showed.

But more than that, the evaluation showed that the school breakfasts that children receive in school is superior in calcium and magnesium to the ones that they get elsewhere, but contains less vitamin B-6, iron, and vitamin A than breakfasts they get elsewhere. Now vitamin A, vitamin B-6 and iron are important nutrients to children and in fact, they are ones that a large proportion of school children don't get enough of. In fact, particularly low-income children don't get enough of them, according to surveys that have been done.

So it makes sense to improve the nutritional quality of the breakfast program so that the consumption of these three nutrients is increased, and in fact, the National Evaluation that USDA reported to this committee and to the country recommends, and I quote, "The School Breakfast meal pattern should be examined and improved."

Now, we think that this improvement could be accomplished by adding and requiring the service of a meat or meat alternate three times a week. That's because right now the breakfast program doesn't require the serving of a meat or meat alternate, and the change in the meal pattern of adding on a meat or meat alternate would add cheese and eggs, which are good sources of vitamin A and different kinds of meat, poultry, fish and peanut butter, which are good sources of iron and vitamin B-6. So the addition of these particular kinds of meat or meat alternates would make a definite difference and improvement in the nutritional quality of breakfast.

The second reason we think this provision is so wise is that by doing this, we could increase participation in the breakfast program and we could increase participation by schools in the breakfast program.

These two things are particularly important because, as we said before, the presence of the school breakfast program in schools does increase the chance that children will get breakfast. So, if we increase the number of schools that have breakfast, we increase the number of children who get breakfast.

Second of all, breakfast tends to be in low-income areas and serve low-income children. In fact, 84 percent of the children who participate in the breakfast program receive free breakfasts. So we

are talking about a provision that will make a big difference to low-income children and schools in low-income areas.

Third, as you all know and have heard many times before, particularly the Chairman, who worked so hard for the school breakfast program from the very beginning, breakfast is important to children and it almost goes without saying, but I would just like to mention briefly two kinds of evidence we have. One is the nutritional evidence. Dr. Ernesto Pollitt at the University of Texas in 1978 reviewed all of the literature that has been written on the school breakfast program and its affect on education.

I would just like to quote you one sentence—his final conclusion looking at that evidence. He said:

> The studies that focused on the short-term effects of hunger or a morning feeding suggest that the provision of breakfast may both benefit the student emotionally and enhance his or her capacity to work on school-type tasks.

I think that says it all. To have breakfast in the morning helps children learn.

But if that isn't enough, we also have evidence from superintendents, from principals, school nurses from around the country every time a breakfast program is started. In fact, I was in Faith's State last week in West Virginia and a school principal sought me out, took me aside and sort of almost took me by the collar and said, "This program is wonderful." She was an older woman and she had been a principal for a long time and she said, "This is the best thing I have ever done in my school." She was amazed. The school nurses had told her that less stomach aches occurred in children in the morning. Children got along better because they had been together at breakfast and had had some time to eat and talk. Kids paid better attention in class.

I was reminded during my West Virginia trip and caught up short again and just as Mayor Morial spoke of earlier, we have got to remember that the breakfast program is important to a lot of children in this country, particularly now with high unemployment. Families need this program and the provision of a meat or meat alternate would help that program.

Now I would like to shift gears for a minute and go to the child care food program, the other program that I wanted to talk about today.

That is a program for preschool children in family day care homes and day care centers. Now, right now, children who are in day care centers and homes all day can only receive two meals and one snack because of the cuts in Federal support for the child care food program. And we understand that one of the provisions that you are considering is to add a meal and a snack to the child care food program and we urge you to adopt that.

I, again, have to turn to nutritional evidence for the reasons why it's important to add those two meals—a meal and a snack—to the child care food program. The Department of Agriculture also did an evaluation of the child care food program and its nutritional impact. This was done by the ABT Associates in Massachusetts.

To quote again directly from the study, the ABT Associates found that the nutritional differences between day care centers and

family day care homes that were participating in the child care food program and ones that were not participating were striking.

Here is what they say: "For every measure examined, participating centers have statistically significantly higher levels of meal quality than nonparticipating centers." Equally striking is the finding that participating family day care homes also serve meals of superior nutritional quality and that these meals generally contain foods of higher quality and variety than those served by nonparticipating centers.

So it's clear that the child care food program has a nutritional impact. But the impact of the cuts on the number of meals from three to two and the number of snacks from two to one have had a negative impact around the country.

For example, a 1983 California rural legal assistance foundation report showed that 41 percent of the day care programs they surveyed were forced to reduce the number of meals served to children because of the cuts. Thirty-eight percent had to turn to deficit spending, borrowing from other parts of their program to make up for those meals, if they wanted to keep them, and that hurt other parts of their programs. Thirty-four percent had to significantly cut back on the variety and quality of foods they served. Now, that is a shame when we have such a successful program, as it was clear from the Department of Agriculture's evaluation.

Hunger Watch USA, the recent Bread for the World report shows similar evidence. The Children's Defense Fund's Child Watch Report also shows that less food was being served to children around the country.

Now, the really sad part about this is that these changes are occurring at the same time that parents are depending more on day care to keep their jobs and to insure nutritious meals for their children. It's also occurring at the same time that there are other cuts in child care in title XX, CETA, and in compensated child care costs for AFDC.

With those kinds of cuts States can't make up for the meals because they are cutting staff. Finally, the cuts are happening when more and more parents are in the work force, particularly mothers. Forty-six percent of mothers with 3-year-old children or younger are in the workforce and 57 percent of mothers of children between 3 and 5 are working.

Finally, and most important, if all of that wasn't enough, preschool children—if any of you are parents, you know and remember back—they eat small, frequent meals, and in fact, nutritionists and health professionals advise small, frequent meals for preschool children to get their nutritional needs.

The reason they do, if you remember, kids under 5 are exploring, they are extremely active and it's hard to keep up with them, they are susceptible to illnesses and they need those small, frequent meals. They also have very short attention spans so they can't pay attention to food very long so those small, frequent meals are important to them. So it just is a reasonable and a very wise social policy to go back to what we had before fiscal year 1982 and increase the snacks and the meals for those children.

Now, in my printed testimony, I have also discussed restorations in the school lunch, nutrition education, and WIC programs and I

would refer you to those in my written statement because I don't want to go on forever.

But let me say in conclusion that this panel that I am part of today has recommended program restoration in school lunch, in breakfasts, in the child care food program and in the nutrition education training program and WIC. Now, these recommendations enjoy wide support in the child nutrition community. But, as Faith has said, $150 million is only 10 percent of the amount of money that was cut in fiscal year 1982.

The changes we have recommended, I think, are the best combination of funds to improve the nutritional status of low-income children, given the limited amount of money that we are talking about. But if we had our druthers, if there were funding available, other priority items that we would talk about at FRAC would be: free meal eligibility changes for school meals; allowing private, nonprofit sponsors to operate the summer food program; a return to the tiering of funding in the child care food program; and funds for the special milk program and for school lunch reimbursements.

So thank you for listening to me today and thank you for the opportunity of addressing the committee on these important matters.

Chairman PERKINS. First, let me compliment the entire panel. I think we all can agree that it's time for us to do something about the breakfast program. When you jerk a youngster out of bed at 6 o'clock in the morning and he's going to ride 25 miles to school—and that's prevalent throughout the Appalachian area because of the consolidation of the schools—and 25 miles back in the afternoon, he or she is not going to eat any breakfast before he leaves. There ought to be a breakfast program in that school for that youngster.

We thought we were doing that years ago. Of course, we got the ground cut out from under us. We had a wonderful breakfast program up until 1982. But now I agree with you wholeheartedly, that we have got to build it back.

Ms. PARKER. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. And insofar as the child care food program is concerned, I think we need to add another meal or a supplement; we have got to do something in that area. Also has been so ably pointed out here this morning, there is general agreement among everybody, that the reduced-price lunch is too high and that reimbursement rates must be lowered. Over the last 2 or 3 years inflation, coupled with the higher reduced price lunch, is pulling the kids out of the program to the extent that they are going to a machine and getting their lunch and wasting their money to a great degree.

We will work with you in every way that we possibly can in marking up this bill next week, and I don't think there will be any doubt about the $150 million for nutrition. So we will try to establish some new guidelines, especially for the reduced-price lunches, and likewise we will try and add another meal to the child care centers of the country. We will also try to do something about the breakfast program; that's something that we have got to address.

Mr. Mayor, I am sure you have observed in your city and representing the Conference of Mayors that you have found the working

poor to be the hardest hit of those participating in the lunch program. Am I correct in that?

Mayor MORIAL. That's correct, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. In West Virginia, you mentioned the high unemployment rate that exists. There again, it's the poor in the inner cities and not only there, but throughout the Appalachian area in the States where the median income is very low. There are poor all the way through your State that are being hit by the lower reimbursement rate.

I think the committee will be willing to address those issues.

Let me call on Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank all of you for testifying this morning. I can't help but reflect that whenever I sit at these nutrition hearings I always feel guilty. No. 1, I am probably one of the great junk food junkies in Congress, and No. 2, I have never been a breakfast man. So when you sit and tell me all of this nutrition stuff, I always feel guilty.

Ms. PARKER. I hope you'll start tomorrow.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I don't want to tell you what I have had this morning because you would both condemn, so we will leave that be as it may.

You know, I think the problem that we all recognize is that nutrition programs are really a combination of two things—nutrition, No. 1, and an assistance program, No. 2, and we always get caught in between whether our focus is income eligibility or our focus is on the proper nutrition. I don't know exactly how we resolve that, to be honest with you, in the budgetary environment in which we deal in government.

A couple of questions in that general line and I would be interested in comments from any of you on—you bring up the breakfast program and request for an additional $38 million, I believe, in that area. That's mainly based on the desire to revise the meal pattern and improve the nutrition quantities that are part of that program. I guess I have got to ask the question, "What comes first, you know, the cart or the horse, the chicken or the egg?" Is there some merit in perhaps agreeing on a revised meal program first and then determining exactly what the cost implications of that kind of a program would be before we just appropriate the money? Does that make sense or not?

Ms. PARKER. Well, I guess I would answer it in a couple of ways. One is that the $38 million figure comes from informal estimates from the Congressional Budget Office and Congressional Research Service and it would certainly—and I am sure the committee will ask them for official estimates of how much it would cost to add those meat or meat alternates to the meal pattern. But the estimates sound pretty reasonable to the child nutrition community and to the American School Food Service Association and so forth.

What we are suggesting is a change in the meal pattern. We are suggesting adding a meat or meat alternate to the meal pattern three times a week, which I think is what you are talking about—a change in the breakfast meal pattern itself.

I am not sure if I am answering your question, but I think that's how I would answer it.

Mr. GUNDERSON. OK. Any other comments?

Ms. GRAVENMIER. Of course, we, from prior experience with the different components in the lunch program and also the child care food program and the summer program I think that the 10-cent estimate would be fairly reliable. It has been factored out.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I would be interested if either of you could provide, for me in particular, and perhaps to the committee, exactly how that 10 cents has been worked out through a formula to give a certain protein or commodity equivalents that we desire. I mean, there has got to be some correlation there and I would be interested in seeing it.

Second, along that same line, I can't speak directly for the school breakfast program, but I have been in contact with various people at different agencies and institutions in my own State of Wisconsin. Obviously, coming from a dairy State like we do, we are very concerned with some of the regulations that presently inhibit the amount of the commodities that they presently can use. They don't understand when we have the surplus commodities that we do at USDA that we don't revise the regulations and try to find a cost-effective way of using these surpluses that we have in storage to provide the additional nutrition that we need in our various government feeding programs.

Is there some way in this budget environment in which we are living today, in which you people, as nutritionists, could suggest to us perhaps some flexibility or revision in those various programs that could allow us—I mean, you bring up the school breakfast program and we look at the cuts in the milk program and things like that—is there a way, for example, with our present commodities that we could make changes that would improve the nutritional level of these programs at not a very expensive new net cost to the Government, because, frankly, it's already there, so we could accomplish both goals within the budgetary environment?

Ms. GRAVENMIER. Of course, the breakfast pattern does include fluid whole milk and I believe Lynn mentioned the fact that cheese and other dairy products could be utilized in the breakfast program, hopefully, to encourage them to serve meat or meat alternate not only three times a week, but almost every day.

I believe I referred to the problem of selling the pattern as it now exists to a parent that is very carefully counting the pennies that they send to school with their children every day, and of course, that does mount up when you have several children in school.

Schools now, of course, may request the dairy products—in our State, essentially, as many as they can utilize to the fullest extent—those would be the bonus commodities. Then, of course, you do have the distribution costs and that was one reason why we were interested in providing the small amount of administrative money to assist the States and the local school boards in delivering and obtaining those commodity foods from the State warehouse to the local school.

I think recent articles in the School Board Journal have indicated that they have a somewhat negative feeling toward the commodity program, both the bonus and the entitlement programs, not because of the quality of the food—they agree that it is of exceptionally high quality, but because of the fact that it is an expense to

transport and store this food at the local level and it is an expense which they cannot always estimate ahead of time in order to make good budget predictions.

I don't know if we have answered your question or not.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am not sure if it's answerable either so I understand.

One final comment on the various school lunch programs. A couple of weeks ago I met with my education advisory committee, which includes administrative people in my schools as well and they have indicated the problems in their school lunch programs. I have got to tell you that the problem wasn't really as much the reimbursement rate or the commodities that come from the Government. There problem is, frankly, labor cost. I don't mean that anti-labor, but it's the high, intense labor capital required in trying to find a way to deal with that to make those meals affordable and they said they think that is the biggest cause of the decline in participation.

When you get the meals up to anywhere from 85 cents to $1 or $1.50 that you are charging and you add that up for a week, all of the sudden you are anywhere from $5 to $8 a week and pretty soon you have got three or four kids in the family and that's $20 and for that they are packing their lunches. I don't know how to resolve that and I am certainly not advocating lower labor wages or anything like that, but I just bring that up as an observation that we are probably going to have to deal with if our goal is nutrition in this area.

Ms. PARKER. Mr. Gunderson, I want to blow a small horn for the Child Nutrition Forum in that we have put out a guide to cutting costs in the school nutrition programs called, "Doing More With Less," perhaps not original, but it certainly says it all. In that book we suggest a lot of ways that schools can cut costs in the school nutrition programs and not hurt the nutritional quality of the programs. Perhaps by cutting costs in other ways, including—for example, we have a chapter on the better use of commodities, including the bonus commodities—schools could cut costs in other areas and still be able to pay their workforce enough so they continue to get good work from the people who work for them.

So I just take the opportunity to blow that small horn. You might want to take a look at that and recommend that to your constituents.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you. I would be interested.

Mayor, a number of questions for you.

Let me begin by telling you that I am coming to visit your city in a couple of weeks with the Ag Committee and they are promising me a good time. I have never been to New Orleans so I am looking forward to that.

Can you give me an idea from your 1981 or 1982 figures the number of people you have had on food stamps or your other food assistance programs in New Orleans?

Mayor MORIAL. I don't recall offhand, Mr. Gunderson, what those numbers are, but I can give you some figures as it relates to the incidence of poverty in the city, and from those figures you might be able to gather some guesstimate as to what specifically those numbers are. I don't have those figures that you have requested,

but we have presently a population of 557,515 citizens at this time. Of that number 143,793 are in excess of 25 percent of below the poverty level.

We have 29,359 families below the poverty level, which represents about 21.85 percent, and that does not include single person households. Coupled with the present rate of unemployment as of July 1983, which was 10.8 percent, those figures would, to some extent, indicate the degree of poverty based upon the various levels of eligibility certainly indicate the food stamp situation but we have had an increase in demand because of high unemployment and joblessness.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mayor, I have been told that your city has returned to USDA some rather significant funds, food assistance money, the past couple of years with which you actually could have a couple thousand more people on the commodity supplemental food programs, that you could have about 3,500 more elderly getting food packages under present authorities, et cetera.

Are there particular reasons, with the testimony you gave and the numbers you have just shown, that you don't use those programs to their fullest? Is it a bureaucratic problem, a regulatory problem?

Mayor MORIAL. The city, per se, does not operate those programs. Mainly those programs are operated through a variety of nonprofit and social service agencies in the city.

Mr. GUNDERSON. OK. But why wouldn't you see to it that they are used?

Mayor MORIAL. Based upon the information that we receive from those agencies, we conclude that that is being used. But one of the problems that we have had has been the problem of distribution of those commodities based upon the manner in which the State handles the distribution of the commodities coming into the State and the processing of those commodities.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Is it the distribution cost problem that we've been dealing with for months?

Mayor MORIAL. It's a combination of that. It's the distribution costs problem and inadequate funding for distribution and storing and warehousing of those commodities, the cost of which becomes excessive, and largely because of the volume size of some of the commodities. For example, the cheese and the processing of those commodities becomes burdensome on many of the social service agencies who are desirable of assisting and providing distribution.

Fortunately, in our city because of the work of a number of social service agencies, we have good support in the nongovernmental sector.

Mr. GUNDERSON. That would be my next question.

The one problem that we face—and I don't think it's necessarily accurate—but as we hear all of the testimony—that it all says that the answer is simply more dollars from the Federal Government. I guess I don't happen to believe that is just exactly the case. I think there is so much that can be done in terms of food assistance programs at the local level.

Not to preach or anything like that, but I did a survey a couple of years ago and everyone of my counties requested food banks. They said, "There is a great need for that," and clearly, between

our civic, voluntary, and religious organizations, it seems to me so simple, that if we are truly concerned, all we have to do is begin this process of getting people, and there are enough good people in every community to regularly bring in food to food banks.

What kinds of programs are the mayors really doing at the local level other than—I mean, I understand that you have to come to us for some help—what are you doing on your own?

Mayor MORIAL. Well, I think we are doing a variety of things on our own. There is a whole litany of those listed in the report which we filed in the record. In our city, for example, we are constantly appealing for contributions for the food bank—cans and other items such as that—and I think there's a very simple approach. That's underway in many cities and the mayors sponsor those efforts.

But let me talk a little bit about this fiscal issue and budget matters. I don't know what the situtation is in the State of Wisconsin, but I think it's universally true throughout this Nation that cities, fiscally, are severe constraints and limitations placed upon them by State constitutions and State statutes. Cities do not have the latitude to generate the fuel for the engine of government, that is, taxes.

Most cities and municipalities, [illegible] where the States are not in the property tax, are restricted by a variety of measures, and where the States have given up the property tax, there are limitations constitutionally placed upon local governments, as it relates to the ad valorum taxes.

Most States, California and Louisiana, for example, have prohibitions in their constitutions against local income taxes or earnings taxes or employment taxes. With the high levels of unemployment, the decline in consumer purchases, sales taxes are on the decline in a number of cities. In most States, even to increase the sales tax requires a referendum vote to do so throughout this country.

The only level of government in this country that has the ability to tax, almost freely, is the Federal Government and, of course, the Federal Government generations ago decided that the property tax was not doable or workable; that's why the Federal Government got out of them.

So cities are under severe limitations. We have difficulty, most cities, providing basic and fundamental services that are needed. That's why we look to the Federal Government. In my city, for example, I took office in 1978. Fifty or sixty percent of the city's budget came from Federal funds. I embarked upon a program to reduce that level of dependence. Our most recent budgets are at about 35 percent intergovernmental funds. So we have done a job and I think mayors around the country have done likewise, to the extent that we can. But we are under limitations, sir. We cannot do it; we cannot generate revenue at the local levels, because of the limitations we are placed under and some of that has to do with the shifts under reapportionment—one man, one vote, ideas which are all good, but what we are seeing develop at the State levels is the rural-suburban coalitions that are strangling the urban centers of America by the voting practices in State legislatures. It's happening all over America. It can be documented.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I would love to have you give that presentation to my rural district. That would be an interesting discussion.

Mayor MORIAL. I would like to give it to them. I would welcome the opportunity.

Mr. GUNDERSON. We ought to set that up. I think you and I could have a good discussion on that.

Mayor MORIAL. When you come to New Orleans, let's talk about it.

Mr. GUNDERSON. All right.

The final question is not meant in a partisan sense, rather in the sense of the dilemma we face up here. You do happen to be a Democratic mayor and you are aware, I am sure, as everyone else is, that this weekend the National Democratic Party is going to make a big media splash about the deficits in this country that exist at the Federal level and they are going to, frankly, point them toward the present administration. You and I both know, following Government, that the Congress of the United States, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives isn't going to pass out any major tax bill; they are talking about $12 billion over 3 years, which is really a joke in solving the deficits. So it's really not a partisan issue in terms of raising taxes. Nobody wants to do it, but we are all going to complain about the deficit and we are all going to sit here at this hearing and at the other hearings and talk about the need to provide additional money. We are talking about $1 billion this morning.

What do we do? How do we resolve this?

Mayor MORIAL. Well, let me say this, sir. I think the problem is one that calls for the utilization of all of our creative talents that exist at the local, State, and the Federal level through those of us who represent the people of America, in a bipartisan fashion. It's imperative that we deal with those very complex economic problems in a bipartisan way—separate and apart from what one's party might——

Chairman PERKINS. I am going to have to interrupt. The gentleman has been going for 35 minutes. We'll come back to him and he can go as long as he can.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am finished, but I must tell you that you are wrong with 35 minutes. I am over 5, but the hearing didn't begin more than 40 minutes ago and I think it's a little unfair to make that accusation.

Chairman PERKINS. The hearing began this morning at 9:35.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. He should have continued. I was beginning to enjoy his great statements.

Mayor Morial, may I, first of all, express a very personal appreciation to the great leadership that you have demonstrated both at the local as well as the national level, and it certainly gives me great pride, as you say, having been a native of your great State. I feel very warm about it. I sometimes feel that if I had stayed there, I might today be the head janitor in one of your banks.

Mayor MORIAL. You would probably be the Governor, Congressman, or the Senator.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

I don't know how this discussion got from child nutrition to the budget, but perhaps it illustrates the problem. I doubt if anyone could disagree with any of the witnesses. It's been a very excellent panel and I think the witnesses have certainly given us great support for what this committee is trying to do.

However, I think the manner in which the colloquy that has just terminated got around to the budget, illustrates the problem. Unfortunately, the facts that you have given us become frightening politically to many individuals. As a result, conservatives will always look for some technical excuse to fuzz up the program so as to permit them to make the cuts that are being made. I am not optimistic, at least at this session, that we are going to be able to accomplish what we should do in terms of the type of preventive programs that you have been discussing this morning.

I think the connection has been well-documented and I think the witnesses dealt with that—how nutrition and the school breakfasts, and so forth, affect education and eventually employment, and I certainly couldn't agree with anyone more than with the mayor when he stated that there is a direct connection in employment. And yet, in passing out the Community Renewal Employment Act, there were those who showed no compassion for the poor, no compassion for the jobless, but only a great concern for the budget deficit.

It would seem to me that this morning the witnesses—all of you—have indicated that these programs are very cost effective, that if you deny the breakfast to a young child, if you don't have good nutrition, that this only adds to the problem—the case of an ounce of prevention certainly being worth a pound of cure. But we don't seem to get that connection. I don't know whether it's because you represent organizations that don't have very strong pacts. If you were able to—including the cities—I have never known a city to donate to any of us financially in terms of a political campaign, and perhaps it's a good thing.

But the excuse is always given that those of us who support these programs are on a spending binge. However, they never focus on the fact that in the long these same programs reduce the costs of government.

I will say that I don't know anyone who sits on my right who perhaps has advocated spending less than I have. But when it comes to certain weapons, nobody who opposes a child nutrition program ever stops to scrutinize the building of a battleship or how many weapons we build. They never offer that same scrutiny, and consequently, it isn't that this administration is spending any less; we are actually spending more, but they have shifted their priorities.

I think human values have been completely lost. So we look upon the budget as a means of cutting out programs that ideologically we don't like and supporting the programs where the big pacts are influential and then we fight over whether the contracts should go to someone in Texas or someone in California, and if it goes to my district I am going to support it and I am not going to question the merit of it.

This is a comment—I couldn't think of a single question to ask the witnesses because they have treated the subject so well that I

think they have not left unanswered any questions. But I am quite sure this session of Congress is going to say, "Well, what you say may be good, but we have got to reduce the budget," and they never stop to think that we paid out $60 billion in interest rates last year, which was 15 times more than we paid out in jobs programs and twice more than we paid out for housing, economic development, and health and no one will say anything to the Federal Reserve Board, the very people who attack these programs.

Well, I just felt that a comment was required.

Mayor Morial, I certainly want to commend you since you are, I think, the only elected official here, for the great job that you have done in the city. It makes me very proud to have had my roots originate there. I look forward to you continuing in the leadership that you have already demonstrated.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Packard.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions. I think that this has been a political discussion on political philosophy and not so much on the merits of nutrition. I think the real issue is how do you provide adequate nutritional needs to the needy children—not to all children, but to the needy children, and how do you do it within the budget constraints that we have? I think that is the decision that the Congress has to make.

I have no further comments.

Chairman PERKINS. Now, Mr. Gunderson, take all the time you want. Go ahead.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have completed my questions, but I sure am glad I asked some questions. I would feel bad for the witnesses if I hadn't.

Chairman PERKINS. Any further questions, Mr. Hawkins?

Mr. HAWKINS. I have none. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment you ladies and the gentleman this morning, the mayor. You have been very informative and very helpful to the committee. We hope to work out here a bill that will be bipartisan. We will have the markup next week. We want to improve the nutrition programs and that's our sole purpose in trying to take advantage of the $150 million on entitlements right now—to increase the entitlement.

It may be that we can go $6 or $8 million above the $150 million, close to $160. We have some staff discussing it with the budget people now. I realize that nutrition needs every penny that we can possibly get. Of course, we have got to be guided by the budget resolution. I personally feel that we could save more money if we didn't have the budget resolution. But be that as it may, now we have it, we have all voted for it even though it is not operating in the democratic manner than many of us anticipated originally, and we are going to do our best to hold fast to the nutrition programs and improve them in the future.

Mayor MORIAL. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. I thank all of you.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:52 a.m., on September 28, 1983, the subcommittee was adjourned.]